

Theresa I. Kallahan, Wells, Vt., in place of B. A. Lewis, retired.

VIRGINIA

Thomas B. Simpkins, Aylett, Va., in place of Imogene Alexander, retired.

WASHINGTON

Vincent B. White, Okanogan, Wash., in place of M. S. Brinkerhoff, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Juanita J. Dixon, Longacre, W. Va., in place of B. B. Turley, transferred.

WISCONSIN

William Schaller, Jr., Barronett, Wis., in place of M. B. Arnes, resigned.

Joseph C. Dinegan, Briggsville, Wis., in place of C. H. Barlow, retired.

Fred W. Thoms, Hawthorne, Wis., in place of D. A. Johnson, resigned.

James R. Morgan, Ladysmith, Wis., in place of F. M. Doyle, retired.

Bertha C. Schippers, Twin Lakes, Wis., in place of John Schippers, deceased.

WYOMING

Ruth A. Arbogast, Sunrise, Wyo., in place of A. E. Morgan, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 20 (legislative day of September 19), 1951:

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Henry Duhan and other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1948, which were today confirmed, were received by the Senate on September 10, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Henry Duhan, which is shown on page 11113, and ending with the name of Clara Mary Sullivan, which appears on the same page.

The nominations of John Robert Propst and other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and sections 303 and 306 of Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on September 11, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John Robert Propst, which is shown on page 11152, and ending with the name of William Russ Cronin, which is shown on page 11157.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Donald E. Adams et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on September 11, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the captions "Nominations," beginning with the name of Donald E. Adams, which is shown on page 11157, and ending with the name of Ruth H. Styron, which appears on the same page.

The nominations of Edward W. Abbot and other officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary appointment as captain, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on September 12, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Edward W. Abbot which is shown on page 11196, and ending with the name of Marcus L. Whitford, which is shown on page 11197.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose divine will can never be thwarted or defeated, we pray that we may now be inspired with that loftier vision and clear understanding which always come to those who wait upon the Lord.

We humbly confess that our hearts so frequently become filled with fear and our groping and faltering spirits fail to live triumphantly because we have put our confidence and hope in our own puny plans and purposes.

Help us to believe that Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace is slowly and surely emerging no matter how dark and heavy the clouds of national and international woe at times may seem to be or how great the welter of confusion and uncertainty in which we are living and laboring.

May the spirit of our blessed Lord, in whose name we pray, be the strength of our souls and the joy of our hearts. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 436. An act to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1864) entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. NIXON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1046) entitled "An act to readjust postal rates"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow and also for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 177]

Allen, La.	Denton	Morrison
Anderson, Calif.	Dolliver	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Ky.	Doyle	Nelson
Bentsen	Granger	Potter
Blatnik	Hagen	Powell
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Hollifield	Roosevelt
Breen	Howell	Sadlak
Bryson	Ikard	Shelley
Budge	Irving	Staggers
Busbey	Jackson, Calif.	Stockman
Chatham	Jonas	Talle
Colmer	Kennedy	Taylor
Coudert	Keogh	Thompson,
Davis, Tenn.	Kersten, Wis.	Mich.
Dawson	Lucas	Walter
Deane	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTOMOBILES FOR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendments thereto, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ELLIOTT, TEAGUE, and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 419 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 244) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules reported three resolutions designed to grant adjustments in salaries to the civil-service and post-office employees.

The resolution just read, House Resolution 491, makes in order consideration of H. R. 244 which is designed to make adjustments in salaries of the post-office employees.

The bill grants an increase to all postal employees of \$400 annually; it grants to hourly employees a 20-cents-an-hour increase and also increases the entrance salary by elimination of the first three grades. These are the principal provisions in the bill.

It was refreshing yesterday to hear all Members who appeared before the Committee on Rules state that in their opinion this group of employees were deserving of an increase. There are some minor differences of opinion on sections of the bill and for this reason the Committee on Rules granted an open rule which will permit opportunity to those Members who wish to do so for the offering of amendments. The resolution provides for 2 hours general debate. I hope the rule will be adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as always, the able gentleman from New York has fully explained the rule and its provisions. Although it is my understanding there are some minor differences of opinion, I know of no one who is opposed to consideration of the bill, H. R. 244.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, for the moment I should like to deviate briefly

from the legislation under consideration and call attention to a deplorable situation. The OPS has placed such stringent restrictions on the meat-packing concerns of this country that many of them have practically had to close down their beef-packing departments. Yet the Department of Agriculture has disclosed that right now there are some 92,000,000 beef animals on American farms.

You will be astounded, as I was, to learn that this week in response to telegrams sent by the Quartermaster General's Office to 212 meat-packing companies throughout the United States asking for bids on 13,000,000 pounds of beef for the men in the armed services, only two companies were able to bid, even though the packers are allowed 50 cents per hundred extra for beef that is purchased for the armed services. They simply cannot buy the beef animals. The two companies who did respond were able to furnish less than 200,000 pounds of the required 13,000,000.

The packers have the facilities and the labor is available, and the farmers have the beef animals, but the three cannot get together because of the OPS restrictions. The packing concerns have men in the field at all times trying to buy animals, but very few are brought in, and the result is that their output is reduced from one-half to three-quarters of normal.

During a recent week 95 plants surveyed by the American Meat Institute were able to buy 102,055 cattle. During the same week a year ago, with open competition they purchased 161,492.

It may be readily understood, therefore, why the legitimate packer simply could not bid on beef for the armed services. They cannot buy the animals. And at this very hour, the Quartermaster General's Office, whose duty it is to buy the food for all of our Armed Forces, is seeking permission from the Secretary of Defense to buy beef from off-shore sources, such as Mexico and Argentina. And this is being done at a time when there are 92,000,000 beef animals in the United States.

The Members of Congress, whether they voted recently for price control or not, never intended that the OPS was going to create a situation whereby the Department of the Army would have to buy meat for the armed services from outside of this country, using the taxpayers' money when there is more beef in the United States than ever before or any place else in the world.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, in your home State, there are millions of head of cattle, and in my own State the same situation exists, and the armed services cannot get the beef here because of the restrictions of the OPS.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 244) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades

for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 244, with Mr. McKINNON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 244 is a bill increasing the salaries of all postal employees, including the officials of the service, the postmasters, and the supervisors.

This bill will give a minimum increase of \$400 to every postal employee with the exception of fourth-class postmasters and hourly employees. Fourth-class postmasters are given a raise of 20 percent. Hourly employees are given a raise of 20 cents an hour.

This bill will not only give every regular employee of the Department a minimum of \$400 but it will also go further and give certain employees who have entered the service since July 1, 1945, either one or two additional grades of \$100, which they have not been given by virtue of law since they entered the service after July 1, 1945.

The bill also provides that the first three grades under the Classification Act of 1945 are abolished, and as a result temporary employees who are now in grade 1 will receive \$700 increase per annum under this bill. You have 150,000 employees who have entered the service since July 1, 1945, who will be given a bonus or gratuitous increase of either one or two grades in addition to the \$400 raise, which will give some of these employees an increase of \$500 and others an increase of \$600.

This bill will cost \$236,000,000. Since July 1, 1945, the postal salaries by virtue of action of Congress have increased already over \$800,000,000, so if you vote this bill as reported out, it means that since July 1, 1945, the total salaries of postal employees will have increased over \$1,000,000,000. That amount of increase in postal employees' salaries amounts to more than the receipts of the post office were about 10 years ago.

I am disturbed about the ever-expanding personnel of our Federal Government and about the constant increase in the salaries of our employees. Today the total salary payroll of the Federal Government is more than \$9,500,000,000. I have been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that before the end of this year the total Federal payroll in salaries will amount to over \$10,000,000,000. That amount was much more than it took to operate this entire Federal Government 12 years ago.

No one wants to be more liberal with the postal employees and the other classified employees of the Government than

I. I think my record since I have been a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will show that I have been a friend to all Federal employees, and that I have always supported fair and reasonable increases for the employees.

I well remember when the Postal Reclassification Act of 1945 was written. At that time the late Mr. Thomas G. Burch, who was chairman of our committee, and Mr. NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, who was the ranking minority member, and I, spent months and months working on the Reclassification Act for postal employees. It was finally adopted as Public Law 134 of 1945. It was the first time that there had been a reclassification of postal salaries since 1925—a period of 20 years. Also the Classification Act of 1949 was a bill introduced by me for the other Federal employees. In my opinion this is excellent liberal legislation. Until the enactment of this legislation there had not been a reclassification of the salaries of the classified employees since 1923.

I am willing to go along with this minimum increase of \$400, but I am not willing to go along and give these additional fringe benefits of \$100 or \$200 extra to the \$400 increase to certain employees who have been employed since July 1, 1945.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might publicly applaud the deep concern the gentleman has manifested for the public welfare. I have found it pleasing to go along with the gentleman on legislation of this character for a good long while, in a reasonable sort of way. I am wondering just how deeply committed the committee may be on the provision in its bill providing for retroactive pay. To me, that is the most indefensible item in the bill. Maybe I can take the rest of it, but that is one provision which I think the concern of the Members of the House of Representatives for the state of the Treasury should compel them to strike down.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. May I state to the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, Mr. Cox, that I wholeheartedly agree with his suggestion. I think this bill should not be made retroactive. The committee made this bill, as well as the two other pay bills which are to follow, retroactive to July 1, 1951. In my opinion, these bills should become effective on the first day of the month following the month of enactment, and if the House will support my amendment which I am going to offer, we will make these three bills effective on the first day of the month following the month in which they become law, and you will save \$225,000,000.

Mr. COX. That is the usual way of legislating, is it not? In other words, making the bill retroactive is exceptional and is not the ordinary manner in which we usually handle legislation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly so. It has been customary in the past, when salaries have been in-

creased, to make the salary increases take effect on the first day of the month following the month of enactment of the law.

Mr. DONDERO. What would that amount to for the month of July and August, that is, what would the retroactive pay feature cost?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. There would be 4 months because this bill would not become law until sometime in October, so you have July, August, September, and October.

Mr. DONDERO. What would it amount to?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It would be one-third of the total amount. As I say, the total cost of the bill is \$236,000,000.

I wish to state very candidly and frankly my position on this legislation. When the question of salary legislation was first considered by our committee, I took this stand. I favored an increase of \$300 for all Federal employees. I further stated to the committee, I thought this \$300 increase should be on a temporary basis, and should be for 1 year only. Furthermore, I was of the opinion that the \$300 increase should be a cost-of-living increase or bonus, and should not be made a part of the permanent salary, and should not be subject to retirement deductions. My idea was to give these employees, especially those in lower brackets, suffering from the increased cost of living, this bonus of \$300 for 1 year and then to determine at the end of that time what our financial condition was, how far the inflationary trend had gone, and just how we stood. I will state frankly I do not know where we are drifting. I am concerned; I am troubled; I do not know what is going to happen to the economy of this country.

So after I made my proposal to the committee of an increase of \$300 on a 1-year basis, I was taken sick. I went to the hospital. During my absence the committee reported out the bill which is now before you.

I want to state that I am going along with the \$400 increase for postal employees, except fourth-class postmasters, and our employees who are on a different basis, but I want to stop at that. I do not want to see this House give these extra benefits, this gratuity to certain employees who have been on the payroll since 1945, \$100 or \$200 increase, which would give them not \$400 but five or six hundred dollars.

Further, I want to see only two grades eliminated. That is what the Postmaster General recommends. That is what the President of the United States recommends. I agree that the starting wage has been too low for those in the two lowest grades, and for that reason we should eliminate those two grades, but I do not think we should eliminate the third grade.

Let us see what the postal employees will be drawing if this bill is enacted. Let me remind you that the city clerks and city carriers comprise nearly two-thirds of all the 500,000 postal employees. The starting salary of the city clerk and the city carrier in first-class and second-

class offices will be \$3,370. As you understand, these postal employees are under classification grades—they advance one grade a year until they reach grade No. 11. The top salary for a city carrier or a city clerk under this bill will be \$4,070. Then in addition to that, every postal employee is entitled to longevity credits; \$100 after 13 years, another \$100 after 18 years, and another \$100 after 25 years. So a postal employee with 25 years' service, that is, a city clerk or a city carrier in the first- or second-class offices, at the end of 25 years will be drawing a total compensation of \$4,370. Clerks in the railway mail service start at \$3,570. Their maximum pay will reach \$4,870. Then their longevity pay, after 25 years' service, will increase that amount to \$5,170.

I realize that there must be some increase in the salaries of postal employees, but we must be reasonable about this. So, in all sincerity, I say that the salaries of city clerks and city carriers in certain first- and second-class offices, the smaller first-class offices and all second-class offices, are getting out of line with the salaries paid to employees in private industry in those towns. For instance, in my home town of over 30,000 people, we have a school system comparable to none. We take pride in our modern, progressive school system.

I have here a clipping from my home town paper, the Jackson Daily Sun, which was received by me yesterday. Let us see how the salary of a school teacher in my home town compares with the salary of a city carrier or a city clerk. A city carrier or a city clerk in my home town will start at \$3,370 under this bill and will eventually go to \$4,370 a year. Here is what the teachers get in my home town. The school teacher with 90 but less than 135 college hours has a starting salary of \$1,800 annually.

Let us see what the school teacher with a master's degree gets in my home city of Jackson, Tenn. As you know, it takes 5 years to acquire a master's degree. In my home town a teacher with a master's degree and less than 1 year's experience teaching school, draws \$258 a month. This amount is increased \$3 a month for each succeeding year until a maximum of \$300 a month is reached after 14 years teaching experience.

There is your situation. I say that we are being more than fair and liberal with these employees if we stop at \$400. Remove the retroactive feature, remove these fringe provisions that give \$100 and \$200 extra increase in pay to employees who have entered the Postal Service since July 1, 1945. I am going to offer an amendment to this effect and I want to see how the House stands on these amendments, because at every turn I have fought for reduction of non-essential and nondefense expenditures. I know that if we give only the \$400 increase and cut out the fringe benefits we will still be treating the postal employees justly, and I appeal to the House to stand by these amendments which I propose to offer.

Let us see about these increases under this bill. They are opposed by the Postmaster General and by the President.

The President in a letter addressed to me dated July 11, 1951, said:

There are many factors which must be considered in establishing scales of compensation for Federal employees. One of the most important is the relationships in the pay rates for the various grades of positions. Federal pay scales in the higher grades tend to be too low in relation to the lower grades for the type of executive responsibilities required. Steps were taken to correct this situation by enactment of the Classification Act of 1949. I consider it vital, as a matter of sound business practice, that these gains be retained. Therefore, I urge most strongly that any increase enacted be on an across-the-board percentage basis rather than on a uniform dollar or sliding scale basis, so that disproportionately lower adjustments for the middle and upper grades may be avoided.

Detailed studies by the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget indicate that a 7-percent across-the-board increase would constitute a fair and reasonable adjustment in classification act compensation scales at the present time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to get a bill that will be acceptable to the President. I do not want this bill to contain these special fringe benefits nor retroactive features which may cause the President to veto it in the last days of the session.

Chairman Robert Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, appeared before our committee. He was our former colleague. We have trust and faith in him. He said that a survey had been made in many cities of the United States and that it showed that the increase in salaries in private industry since January 1, 1950, was about 7 percent. Now, if we give this \$400 minimum and nothing else to the postal employees it will give all of them more than 10 percent and some of them 14 and 15 percent. We should try to conform our action today to the policies of the Wage Stabilization Board, and I insist that these fringe benefits violate the principles established by the Wage Stabilization Board. I am hopeful that the amendments which I will offer will be adopted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have from our committee a somewhat different piece of legislation from that which we had yesterday. Yesterday some of us tried to save a little money for the taxpayer, or thought we were, but we did not meet with as much success as we had hoped.

This legislation is not difficult to explain. The bill, H. R. 244, before us today, is a somewhat different measure than the original H. R. 244 as introduced by a distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The bill as originally introduced in substance provided for the elimination of the first four grades in the postal service and for an increase of 17 percent across the board. It has a good many other features. If you will examine the bill you will find it covers several pages because the so-called Miller bill is the first part of this bill that has been stricken out. The committee saw fit to strike out the provisions of the original Miller bill and to insert in lieu thereof a proposal that we pay all

postal employees a flat increase of \$400 a year except that fourth class postmasters would get a 20 percent increase, and there is also a provision to increase the hourly wage employees in line with the \$400 increase. Now, that is the general proposal.

The Miller bill as originally introduced as near as may be determined would cost approximately \$372,500,000. The proposal before us as approved by the committee would cost approximately \$236,000,000 as the distinguished chairman of our committee just suggested when he was explaining the bill to us.

We spent a considerable amount of time discussing this legislation and it is more or less, as generally occurs in committee, a compromise that was reached by the committee. The Postmaster General did oppose this legislation, or, to put it another way, he proposed the elimination of two grades and I think suggested a 10 percent across the board increase. As near as we can figure out, his proposal would cost about \$202,000,000. The President, as our distinguished chairman has said, suggested a 7 percent increase for all Government employees. This includes classified workers, postal employees and all of them. Our chairman stated that he has a letter from the President and I hope he will place that letter in the RECORD.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the able gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Kansas if this bill, H. R. 244, is the same as the bill that was originally introduced? I have been receiving a number of letters from people who are very much interested in H. R. 244 and I would like to know if it is the same bill as originally presented to the committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to answer the gentleman from Colorado, who has expressed a deep interest in legislation on behalf of postal employees. He has at all times been most helpful in securing legislation for the best interests of those employed in the postal service. His inquiry is an important one, and I think the Members should know that we do not have before us the original Miller bill. This is a different bill and is a different approach to the problem from the bill introduced by Mr. MILLER. I regret Mr. MILLER is not here so he could explain the situation. The original Miller bill, being fair now to all parties concerned, upon which hearings were held, and it is the measure that created a great deal of correspondence and interest across the country, and it is the measure with respect to which you received this correspondence. I think it should be added that any Member who wants to do so, certainly has a right to submit the provisions of the Miller bill for the bill under consideration as a substitute so it may be determined whether this House wants the original Miller bill instead of the one under consideration.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will the gentleman point out what changes were made from the original bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I attempted to point out a moment ago that the original bill provided, in substance, for a 17-percent increase for all postal employees' salaries and for elimination of the first four grades. This bill is different in that it provides a flat increase of \$400 for the employees. The gentleman can readily understand that if you provide a 17-percent increase you would, in substance, pay a \$2,500 employee a smaller sum than you would those who are getting higher salaries. It was the opinion of the committee that this was intended to be a cost-of-living increase, so the committee saw fit to handle it in this manner.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to ask just one final question. Do I understand that it was the attitude of the committee that the present bill is preferable to the original bill, in that it gives everyone a flat \$400-per-year increase, and that it had the substantial support of the committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will say to the gentleman that after hearings were held on the original bill, H. R. 244, the committee struck out all of the provisions of the bill except the enacting clause, the name of the author, and inserted new legislation. That is the reason I have gone to the trouble and put forth this effort to explain it. As a matter of fact, I think it is fair to say that in executive session the original H. R. 244 was not discussed to any extent. It was simply amended by putting in the \$400 that I have just referred to, and these other matters that I have mentioned.

Mr. CHENOWETH. And this had the substantial approval of the committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who has also shown a great deal of interest in this legislation.

Mr. STEFAN. As I read the bill before us now, it seems to be absolutely different from the original Miller bill regarding which we received so much correspondence. I think the gentleman from Kansas has answered the question that I was going to propound to him. I did not quite get the difference between the original Miller bill and this bill. Reading the hearings on this bill, it would indicate that the hearings were really held on the original Miller bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct. That is the reason I went into detail to explain the situation because hearings were really held on the Miller bill. The cost of the Miller bill as originally introduced is approximately \$372,500,000 and the approximate cost of this bill as now presented is \$236,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. So that those who have been writing to us so voluminously are thinking today that we are working on the original H. R. 244 Miller bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am inclined to think not, for the reason that the representatives of these various postal organizations have appeared before the committee from time to time, and it is my

information that the postal organizations representing the employees are in general accord with the proposal we are considering today, and, as far as I know, are satisfied with its provisions.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this legislation. He has at all times shown a special interest in the welfare of employees in the postal service. His interest in their behalf has been most helpful.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it a fact that this bill is a package bill. In other words, it all hangs together, and that the committee adopted it in that fashion, so that if you take out one thing and leave in others, you are not carrying out the committee intent as to what the committee thought was fair to the postal workers?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The committee submitted what it thought was fair, by a majority vote; that is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. What I mean is, each part is necessary; in other words, if you say two grades instead of three grades or take out something else, then you are changing what the committee felt as a package was fair.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am one of those who always insist that if a Member wants to offer any changes he is free to do so, because I have always been much opposed to rules that would permit no amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. What I am trying to get at is that the package as far as the committee was concerned was indivisible?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It may be regarded as a package.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to have the judgment of the gentleman from Kansas on one or two phases of this matter. No. 1: Does the increase of \$400 all the way across the board protect the economic rights or equity of the low-paid employee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That was the viewpoint of the gentleman from Kansas who has the floor, at least, that we intended it to take care of the increased cost of living.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The 17 percent would have given the high-salaried employee a greater benefit than it would have given the low-salaried employee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is self-evident.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So the \$400 takes care of the low-paid employee.

Now, No. 2: By the shift in the grades does this bill now before us, I mean the committee amendment, not the original bill, H. R. 244, but the bill before us as reported by the committee give the low-paid employees the benefit of \$100 or \$200 or \$300 by raising their grades?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. The gentleman means in addition to the \$400?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, in addition to the \$400.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that the maximum amount that any employee could receive under this bill we are now discussing would be how much?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Seven hundred dollars.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman this question. I wanted to ask it of the chairman of the committee [Mr. MURRAY], but we had no chance to interrogate him at all, either yesterday or today, and that is rather strange, to me. In the industrial centers, say, or in the area north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi River where you get more into the industrial areas, did the testimony show that the Post Office Department is losing employees by reason of their inability to meet living expenses and through their shifting to industrial operations?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There was considerable testimony before the committee to the effect that where there is a considerable amount of industry, especially war industry, as it may be called, they were losing a number of employees from the postal service. That is true generally speaking. I do not have the figures on it because it varies in different localities, but generally speaking those who are permanently employed, who have been in the service for some time, stay pretty well on their jobs. There is not much turn-over in those higher positions generally.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The postal employee does not shift to a professional job but he goes into industry where substantial training is not necessary, so it seems to me that the example given as between school teachers and postal employees does not apply to this case at all.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman explain to the House why it was that the committee took so long to report the bill? Was it because of the failure of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to make recommendations or to give the committee the benefit of its information and knowledge on these subjects?

Mr. REES of Kansas. To some extent, that is true. It did take longer than some of the members of the committee, including myself, felt that it should to secure reports on this legislation, because our committee generally holds hearings only after the reports have been received from the agencies involved.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman advise the committee just what part of the 500,000 employees affected, would be affected by this doing away with grades 1, 2, and 3? I think that information would be appreciated.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I think so too. There would be 83,000 employees affected by that provision. However, in addition there would be 150,000 em-

ployees in round figures whose salaries would be increased by \$100 or \$200 annually under subsection (c) of section 1.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I have a letter from Walter J. Donnelly, chairman of the Fairfield County Legislative Committee in my district, which is as follows:

This week H. R. 244 is scheduled for debate and vote. Even before it reaches the floor, I must warn you that the committee report is in error. I cannot vouch for all the figures but since the bill provides for the elimination of the first three grades and a general increase of \$400, it follows that the changes shown in section 12 (a) of P. L. 134, Salaries of Clerical Employees, and so forth, are in error. Three grades from eleven leave eight, not five. Also, adding \$400 to the maximum grade salary of \$3,670 raises it to \$4,070 not \$4,293.90. Apparently, the committee report uses the figures of the bill as introduced and not as reported out.

The Senate, when debating the companion bill, S. 355, seemed to have difficulty explaining the elimination of grade provisions. For your information, I will give you a brief summary. Public Law 134 (1945) added six grades (or step increases) to the previous five-grade system. Those in the service were raised four grades but everyone entering after June 30, 1945, started in grade 1, the entrance salary established in 1926. In spite of all our efforts to remedy this injustice, nothing was done until 1949, when grades 1 and 2 were dropped for those receiving regular appointments, and grade 2 was dropped for substitutes. Inasmuch as almost all substitutes must serve more than a year before receiving a regular appointment and a small sprinkling of jobs are the only positions for which direct regular appointments are made, only grade 2 was actually eliminated. In addition, those men above grade 2 received no benefits, while they actually composed the bulk of the postwar appointees.

Under the House bill, H. R. 244, these men will be advanced two grades. Those who have already benefited by the 1949 law will advance, one or no grades. New appointments will be to the present grade 4.

What can the gentleman say about that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The top salary is \$4,070—if that is what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. MORANO. Then this paragraph in his letter is correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, he has reference to the increase provided in the bill, as introduced.

Mr. MORANO. And the committee report is wrong?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No. That is not correct. The top salary to which he refers is \$4,070.

Mr. MORANO. According to what he says, the committee report says \$4,293.90. I think the Chairman of the Committee, himself, used that figure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The report is correct, and states that the salary is \$4,070. What the gentleman is referring to, is the rule which requires a committee report to contain changes which the bill, as introduced, makes in existing law.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman who has contributed greatly to the enactment of legislation for the postal employees of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman kindly explain specifically the changes in grade provided by this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill eliminates the first three grades for all employees, and renumbers the remaining grades in sequence beginning with number one. This will increase the entrance salary by \$300, and when combined with the provisions of the other part of the bill, these persons would get, of course, \$700.

Mr. JOHNSON. In other words, you are just raising the starting point of the lower salary by doing that; is that correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, for most employees the entrance salary will now be \$3,370 annually.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman please tell us how many grades of the classification law have been eliminated before these three grades?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Two grades in regular positions.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman please correct the figures that he just gave me in answer to my question? I am advised that only about 33,000 employees will be affected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Eighty-three thousand in one group and 150,000 in another group. That is my understanding. The question is, as I understand it, how many employees would receive increases in salary in addition to the \$400 item. I will yield to my distinguished chairman to answer the gentleman, if he will.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The number is about 233,000.

Mr. BAILEY. That is in grades 1, 2, and 3?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The 83,000 are in grades 1, 2, and 3. Those grades are the temporary employees that constitute the great bulk of the 83,000 employees who are in those grades. Those who are getting the bulk of the increase would be temporary employees in grade 1. These employees who get a gratuitous gift of one or two grades number about 150,000. They have been in the service since July 1, 1945, or subsequent to that time.

Mr. BAILEY. What I would like for the Record to show is that by doing away with grades 1, 2, and 3 you only affect 83,000 people.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Then that is fair enough, if the Record shows that.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. These temporary employees are all in grade 1.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Also, there are 150,000 employees who will receive either one or two other automatic \$100 increases.

Mr. VURSELL. There must be some misunderstanding. What employees have not received any increase in salary since 1945?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield myself two additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VURSELL. The question is, What employees have not had an increase since 1945?

Mr. REES of Kansas. All postal employees have received several increases since 1945.

Mr. VURSELL. I have been laboring under the impression that since 1946 at least there has been an increase of so many hundred thousand a year up to over \$2,160 for all postal employees. Am I in error on that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We were talking about a group of employees who did not receive their grade increases by reason of operation of law.

Mr. VURSELL. How many?

Mr. REES of Kansas. One hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. VURSELL. Will you recite, before you yield the floor, what increases have been voted by this Congress in the past 6 or 8 years?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will have those figures for the gentleman in just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] the amount I understand is \$1,370.

Mr. VURSELL. Over how many years?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Six years.

Mr. VURSELL. That has gone to all employees, with the exception of this 150,000?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Those have been the increases, if they were in the service on July 1, 1945. In other words, if you were in the postal service the last 6 years you would have received this increase.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I understood that this Miller bill was first introduced in October 1950, and has been pending in this Congress since the first day of the Congress. The committee is just bringing it toward the end of September for floor action. So there has been a delay by the committee. In view of that, with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] that salaries and wages generally have gone up since October 1949, about 10 percent; and on Mr. Ramspeck's statement, about 7 percent since January 1950, I do not see why the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Tennessee do not take the position that there should be retroactive pay. There is no doubt the cost of living has gone up since October 1949. If all the other salaries and wages have gone up that amount, why should not postal workers be paid likewise and be treated equally?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman is supporting Mr. Ramspeck's view of this matter, Mr. Ramspeck says the increase should be a little over 7 percent; if that is what the gentleman has in mind. It has been suggested that the

\$400 might be able to make up some of those benefits. Under the 5-minute rule the gentleman can set forth his views in greater detail.

Mr. FULTON. I am questioning the gentleman as to the point of retroactivity. Why should it not be retroactive? First, since the committee was so long; and, second, since these increases in the cost of living took place long ago, as far back as October 1949, even on the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and according to Mr. Ramspeck, since 1950?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize that the committee took a great while in bringing out this legislation; I am willing to concede to the gentleman in that respect. But I do not take entire responsibility for delaying this legislation any more than anyone else, and I shall not charge anyone on the committee with delaying it. The fact of the matter is that our committee has been in session a great deal of the time since the early part of January considering this and other legislation which you are going to consider as soon as this bill is over. I do not know that that is any reason to justify the delay, yet the committee has been consistently busy and hard at work since the first of the year. This bill is a compromise of the whole problem before us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has consumed 27 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 244, actually has three purposes. First, it will to some degree adjust postal salaries to meet the increase in the cost of living since June 1950. Second, by eliminating the lowest three grades, it will assist the Post Office Department in the recruitment of new personnel. The Postmaster General, himself, pointed out the difficulties in securing employees at the present low entrance grades. Third, by the granting of one or two additional grades to employees who entered the service after July 1, 1945, it will partially correct an inequity toward a small group of employees, practically all of whom are veterans of World War II, and grant, in part at least, benefits already enjoyed by all other postal employees. This I will explain later.

The necessity for an increase of at least \$400 for all employees is obvious. On November 30, 1950, there were introduced into this Congress, bills asking for a 17 percent increase for all postal employees. This was based on the rise in the cost of living up to that date. Since that date, the cost of living has not declined and the trend is still upward. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission in his testimony to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service stated that it would require an increase of 21 percent to meet rises in living costs since 1949. Four hundred dollars is, therefore, a modest request.

I agree with my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVRS] this bill is a pack-

age; you cannot take out any single part without injuring the entire structure.

In setting the effective date of July 1, 1951, the committee has only in part made up for the 10 months that have passed since postal employees first asked for this increase on November 30, 1950. It is a firmly established principle in collective bargaining in private industry to grant retroactive pay for a period during which negotiations were taking place. The Congress on May 21, 1946, passed a salary increase for postal employees retroactive to January 1, 1946—Public Law 386. So there is ample precedent for such action on the part of the Congress. Even an effective date of January 1, 1951, could be justified by the circumstances. However, the effective date of this bill as proposed by the committee is only July 1, 1951.

During all of this period of time, during this 10-month period, these 500,000 employees and their families have waited for us to act. They have incurred debts in order to meet their obligations and I think the least we can do is to make this retroactive as of July 1, 1951.

The enactment of permanent legislation at this time is absolutely necessary. The postal establishment has to compete with outside industry both in recruiting and retaining labor. The permanency of contracts is one of the outstanding contributions of labor-management negotiations. An increase which will be wiped out after a year or two is unfair to the employees and to the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, let us not kid ourselves. You talk about making it temporary? Do you think you can take it back? Has the Government ever taken anything back that it has given? Let us not kid ourselves that the cost of living is going to go lower. In my estimation, and I believe in your better judgment, it is going to go higher. So I think we ought to satisfy these people and face the reality and make it permanent.

Much has been made of the statement that it is possible for employees to receive a \$700 increase under this act. This is not exactly true. Any regular postal employee starts in grade 3 at present and the elimination of the lowest grades will not help him at all. Present grade one substitutes, of whom there are a small number, will have their hourly rate increased from \$1.31½ per hour to \$1.66½. It should be noted however, that these employees work only when they are called and it is rarely that they work a full week.

I think the least we can do is to help these people by correcting this inequity.

Another small group of employees will have one or two grades added to the increase provided by this bill. And this is fully justified. Public Law 134, effective July 1, 1945, granted four grades increase to regular employees, but retained the entrance grade in effect prior to the act, and did not give such up-grading to substitute employees. To correct this inequity, Congress passed Public Law 317, on March 6, 1946, which provided that substitutes who had been on the rolls prior to July 1, 1945, should

receive the four grades upon their acquiring status as a regular employee. Public Law 577, enacted August 1, 1946, and which was sponsored by our distinguished majority leader, the honorable JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, extended the same benefits to veterans who had been on eligible registers but had been unable to accept appointment due to induction into the Armed Forces. Only those employees who entered after July 1, 1945, received no up-grading benefits since the entrance grade remained at the same grade level.

Mr. Chairman, it is to correct that inequity, it is to protect these boys who fought in World War II, who came back and entered the post-office system after July 1, 1945, which the enactment of this law will protect.

On October 28, 1949, by the enactment of Public Law 428, the Congress corrected this inequity in part by eliminating the first two grades for regular employees and the second grade for substitute employees. However, there are still a number of employees who entered the postal service since July 1, 1945, who either received no benefits from Public Law 428—as they had already reached the third grade at the time—or who received only one grade. The provisions of this bill would correct this inequity by granting the two grades to those who did not benefit from Public Law 428, and by granting one grade to those who received only partial benefits. The correction of this inequity is fully justified by previous legislation already enacted, and would correct a present injustice to a small group of lower-paid employees, almost all of whom entered the postal service from the ranks of our Armed Forces.

I cannot, therefore, urge you too strongly to support the committee report of H. R. 244 and to grant to our deserving, hard-working, loyal and devoted postal employees at least \$400 permanent increase in salary, effective July 1, 1951, and to enact without amendment the elimination of grades and the up-grading which I have shown are fully justified and necessary. The Members of this Congress have time and again expressed their pride in the job done by our postal employees. The enactment of H. R. 244 will be in some measure an indication of our appreciation of a job well done.

My colleagues, there has been a lot of talk here about economy, and I congratulate our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] because I know that he is absolutely sincere when he speaks about economy, and I know that all of us have the utmost respect for the chairman of our committee, but I think it is false economy, absolutely false economy, when we can give billions of dollars to aid foreign countries, and we cannot take care of our own American people. These men who run the post offices are performing one of the greatest jobs in the world. They are delivering the mail to Korea, to Europe, to your offices, to your homes, and here in Congress, braving all kinds of weather and all kinds of hardships. They are not paid a proper

wage, and I say to you that these inequities must be corrected. You will be doing justice to the taxpayers by passing this bill, because there is not a single taxpayer who has objected to it. I have not received one letter against this bill, and I come from that great city of New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that many Members have spoken about the large number of letters they received from the postal workers, and is it not a fact that the postal workers have written and written and written and worked and worked and worked because they feel the economic pinch they are in.

Mr. ANFUSO. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York for the very fine statement he has made and I wish to join with him in practically everything he says particularly about the hardships embraced by postmen in delivering the mail. This is the one direct service that the people of the country receive for their tax dollars.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is not a summation of the gentleman's remarks that we have been rather skimpy rather than generous in this bill, and that viewing the situation since the outbreak of the Korean war in June, 1950 that the rate increases we are proposing here, in comparison to the salaries provided the workers in the heavy industries, are wholly justified? I would like to make one other point in connection with the gentleman's remarks. Yesterday we passed a rate increase of approximately \$126,000,000. That, added to the increase in the fourth-class rate that goes into effect in October of \$104,000,000, would bring the total up to \$228,000,000, just \$3,000,000 short of the cost of this bill; and, further, when we remember that the Senate has already passed a rate bill providing for an increase of \$400,000,000, we cannot here be accused of not providing the money to pay this cost-of-living increase.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support of the passage of legislation to increase the salaries of our postal employees.

The bill now before us, which has an effective date of July 1, 1951, provides for a \$400 annual increase in salary to all employees in the postal field service paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters, who will receive a 20-percent increase. Hourly employees will

receive an increase of 20 cents an hour. An additional increase in the entrance salary for postal employees is provided through the elimination of the first three salary grades. Another provision gives one or two grade increases to those postal employees who entered the service after June 30, 1945, and who have not received at least two grade increases by operation of law.

The last salary increase for postal employees was an increase of \$120 a year for those employees paid on an annual basis with proportionate increases for fourth-class postmasters and employees paid at an hourly rate. This pay raise was effective November 1, 1949. Since that time there has been a marked rise in living costs. In my judgment the increases provided in this bill are necessary to help employees meet the increased cost of living and to enable the postal service to recruit employees having the necessary qualifications to carry on this vital Government service.

Our postal workers as employees of our Government are entitled to a living wage. Present salaries are not sufficient to meet the increased cost of living. It is unfair and unjust to require them to struggle along to support their families on inadequate wages. Industry in general has recognized the necessity of increasing its wages to enable its workers to meet the present high cost of living. Our Government has lagged behind. It should without further delay grant the necessary increase to these faithful Government workers that will enable them to live and raise their families in a manner that will be in accord with the American standard of living.

Our country has been generous in the aid we have extended to other countries to enable them to raise the standard of living of their people. The amount has been many billions of dollars. Why should we hesitate to be just in the matter of wages to be paid to our Government employees? The total annual cost of the increase provided for in the bill now before us is approximately only \$235,760,000. This is such a small amount in comparison to what we have already extended to assist others throughout the world, that we should not hesitate to pass at the earliest possible day legislation that will give some measure of relief and aid to our own Government employees.

My views in this respect are not confined to only the case of our postal employees, it extends to all classes of our Government employees. And, my support will be given to bills that will increase their compensation which I understand, and certainly hope, will come before us for action before any adjournment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that some Members of this House do not appreciate the position that these employees are in. Those that we are now seeking to help most in this bill are the ones who need help the most. They are the young people of the country, and they are the people that are

raising the children of the country. Now, unless you have a family of your own and have been hard up and poor, you cannot really understand what this bill is about. I can qualify. I have had a family and I have been poor, and I am not very far beyond that limit now. But when you think of these men receiving money to take care of their families and not getting enough to live on, is that what Uncle Sam wants? They are not working on commission. It is none of their concern what the postal rates are. They have hired out to the United States of America to work. Do we want to let the world know that we are putting our employees on a starving wage? Right while I am talking to you today, I will guarantee you that there are thousands of employees that are working nights, working during vacations, to get money enough to support their families.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. It has been estimated that in the city of New York 40 percent of the postal employees have to find other employment in order to live.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Seventy-two percent of the employees in Detroit have other jobs.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank both gentlemen for what they have said.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say further in substantiation of the gentleman's statement that the Postal Credit Union of Detroit in the first 8 months loaned over \$1,000,000 to the employees to buy bread and butter and the other necessities of life.

Mr. BURDICK. Those who think that we should not extend this bill retroactively do not really understand what you are doing. The reason we want this retroactive feature is because at the present moment there are thousands of these people that have borrowed money from their friends and relatives to keep going. Extend the bill retroactively to June 30, 1951, so that these employees can pay up, in part, what they have borrowed to keep going.

There is just one question for you to decide, and I have decided it as far as I am concerned. I have decided myself that these men are entitled to a living wage when they are working for the Government of the United States. We can loan Great Britain thirty billions and nobody loses any sleep over that.

Mr. RANKIN. We lose the money, though.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes, we lose the money, of course. But if we happen to want to hand out a measly \$250,000,000 to men who want something to eat, who are working for us, we have nightmares at night and cold sweats during the day.

You can do just as you want to about this but I am not going to be a Member of Congress regardless of party and see 500,000 employees of the Federal Government living on an income that does not pay the cost of living.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks made by my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. He is a true friend of the postal employees and also a supporter of every piece of liberal legislation that benefits the average citizen.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed increase called for in this bill is a compromise which was arrived at in our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I hope that no amendment will be introduced which will, in any way, cut back on what we propose to give the postal employees in this measure.

This bill, H. R. 244, when it was first introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], called for a more substantial increase than the \$400 proposed in the amended bill. It originally called for a 17-percent increase and the elimination of the six lower grades in postal employ.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is a distinguished member of our committee and he understands this postal legislation and employee problems as well as any Member of the Congress. He is sympathetic to the problems of the workers in the postal service and he is well aware of the great service they perform.

I am sorry that my very good friend and colleague from California is not able to be here today when his bill is before us. I know that he would like to participate in the discussion. I am sure that we would profit from what he would have to say. Unfortunately, he has been ill for a long while and is now recovering from a serious operation. On order of his physician he is now at his home in California so that he may get the required rest he needs. I hope that when the next session opens the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be back strong and healthy as would all like to see him.

I introduced a bill, H. R. 340, which was identical with the original Miller bill, H. R. 244. I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] shares my thoughts when I say that the present compromise of a \$400 boost is not adequate to meet the most modest needs of postal employees.

The Bureau of the Budget and other agencies of the Government have testified before our committee that it would take an increase of 20 to 25 percent to bring postal pay to the point where it would put the living standards of these Federal employees on a level enjoyed by postal workers in 1939.

Therefore, I hope there will be no attempt to go backwards on this legislation. I hope that you will reject any attempt to strike out the retroactive provision in this bill or to weaken this bill in any way. It would be a gross injustice.

After our generous treatment of the big publishers yesterday, it is rather difficult for me to believe that there will be any substantial support in the attempt to chisel down on this pay bill.

I have previously stated that the Post Office Department has long been a

whipping boy for the reactionaries who have always been most generous to the special interests, and who frown upon any progressive legislation which gives a measure of justice to the little fellow.

Federal employees have been smeared as bureaucrats and often have been held up as a bunch of loafers. I would not say that there are no evils in Federal employment, but most of the criticism is false and made largely for political purposes.

It is somewhat ironical that those most responsible for unethical and irresponsible statements and smears of Federal employees come from those who frequently give lip service for a higher standard of morals and ethics in Government.

Most of the criticism about bureaucracy by administration opponents is also the result of irresponsible and dishonest political attack.

If you really want to see an effective bureaucracy and effective machine politics come to Pennsylvania where you can learn a few tricks that you would not think possible.

Postal employees are in my opinion efficient and faithful public servants. Every member of this committee knows this to be true.

Let me say in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] that this legislation has been in our committee for a long time, but it is not true that any substantial delay was due to the lack of cooperation by the Bureau of the Budget or the Post Office Department.

The delay was largely due to disagreement in the committee.

It was pointed out during committee hearings that the low standards of pay and the increased burden on postal workers as a result of curtailment and unwise appropriation cuts have resulted in a low morale in the service.

It has brought about a large turn-over in labor and a reduced efficiency of the postal service.

I hope you will oppose every crippling amendment and show just a little of the generosity you displayed yesterday on postal subsidies.

I want to say, in closing, that I agree with my colleague [Mr. ANFUSO] on what he said about false economy. It seems to me that we are practicing false economy which is most wasteful as a result, not only in cutting down essential public service but also in wasting the real wealth of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 244.

I think that this bill is an excellent bill in many ways, although I am also inclined to agree that it may perhaps be a little inadequate. There is no question, judging by the testimony that we received in our committee, that this \$400 raise will barely take care of the rises in living costs.

I would like to again point out, as I have done before, that we work slowly

in committee. In fact, all committees are bound to work slowly, and for that reason this bill which is now being brought out should have been passed last January. The figures have already changed. What was true then is no longer true. Living costs have gone up very considerably since last January. So for that reason I, too, hope that nothing will be done to strike out the retroactive clause in this bill. It is a necessity.

I would like to go a little further. Before this bill is passed—and I am very sure it will be passed overwhelmingly—I know that one amendment will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY]. This amendment I want to commend to the House because it will more adequately care for our rural carriers, and they certainly should not be neglected in this legislation.

I am also going to offer an amendment to the bill, and by this amendment we would establish an escalator clause. This escalator clause is patterned on that which has already been adopted by the General Motors Corp. and many others. What it would do is simply this: It would take care of the rising cost of living. It would be governed by the index, so that automatically these people would be taken care of before 6 months elapses, before they have to borrow money from their friends or relatives, before they have to go through these many anxious weeks and months of doubt and frustration, wondering whether they will be taken care of or whether they will not.

It is certainly true that this Congress has been more than generous in its help to foreign nations and foreign nationals. We have never questioned their demands. We have raised their standards of living, but have we raised the standard of living of our own people? Not entirely. Certainly not in the field of Government employees. For that reason I hope that through this bill and through the amendments thereto, we will bring the standard of living of the Government workers into line with the highest standards prevailing in the country. We have the right to demand the best service of Government employees. We do demand it. We cannot have it if we have this continuous turn-over which is caused by poor pay and bad working conditions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to another difference between this and the money this Government has been wasting on foreign countries. These people are all Americans.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes, sir. They are not only all Americans but they are all taxpayers. So that when we help them we are helping the Government of the United States.

For that reason I sincerely hope that the bill as written will be passed, and that these amendments which will broaden the scope and will help these Government workers, will also be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of the points embraced in this bill have been well covered by the speakers who have preceded me. Since the introduction of this legislation, I, of course, have received numerous letters from our letter carriers and postal clerks, as have you. One of those letters, I should like to read to you today.

If all of us will, for a moment, put ourselves in the position of this letter carrier there will be little doubt as to the vote on this legislation.

The letter reads:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This has to do with postal pay legislation which is pending before your committee.

No doubt, you've seen stacks and stacks of statistics, figures, and graphs on the "average mail carrier." Those reports have their value, I'm sure, but they are rather lifeless and academic. I want to tell you here about a real life situation. It might help to prove a point.

I am a carrier, lower-grade, with a semi-monthly take-home pay of \$114. I have a wife and two children, one 16 months and the other 4 months old. We are paying out of that \$114 twice a month, \$23.50 on the house, about \$25 on furniture, about \$15 on insurance, about \$7 on transportation, and about \$10 on utilities, about \$12.50 for tithes to the church (we are Christians and tithe 10 percent of our income). That leaves about \$21 for groceries for two weeks—out of which amount we have to buy milk and the very expensive baby food for our children. That's not much for food, as you surely know. We seldom eat meat, and believe it or not, manage on two meals a day usually. We get milk for the children, but my wife and I can't afford to drink it. Every payday, when we work on our budget, we say, "Now we've just got to have more money left for food"—but somehow or other we don't. We neither one smoke or drink, and we spend nothing, absolutely nothing, for entertainment. We aren't able to save anything. And my uniforms are wearing out, our clothes are needing replacements. But there's no money to do it with. There'll come a day when we must face that necessity, but we don't know what we'll do about it.

Sad story, isn't it? I really wouldn't bother you with it, but you fellows up there hold the "yes" or "no" for thousands of us in this same boat. We can't strike or bargain or do any of those things that our friends in industry do. All we can do is tell you our story and have faith that you will be kind enough to vote in our favor.

I'm not asking for better working conditions, shorter hours, etc. Since the curtailment my route is so overloaded that I seldom ever get it done during the day. I go to work about 5:00 every day and grind at such a fast pace that when I get home I'm hardly fit for anything else. (And this in spite of the fact that I'm young, healthy, decidedly non-neurotic, and love the Post Office.) It would help my feelings a lot, though, if I didn't have to worry so much about being able to support my family on the pay I get.

There you have it. I've always felt it's degrading to beg, so I won't do that. I just trust you'll do the right thing.

I urge you to respond to this sincere plea by voting for the Committee bill now before us for consideration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 244, to reduce the number of grades for the various positions in the Post Office Department, and for certain pay increases designated therein.

Although this bill does not represent all of my thinking as to what should be done for postal employees, I believe it is the best bill that could be brought to the floor after considering the many matters that had to be taken into consideration in such a bill as this.

H. R. 340, which has been previously introduced, would have eliminated the first six grades. It was my feeling that at least the first five pay grades should have been removed. One of the problems of the post offices in my district has been to get good personnel for the salaries that are available. By the elimination of the first five pay grades, I believe we would have made more attractive a career in postal work. Most of the young men in my communities who wish to start with the post office are rearing families. I happen to be one of the Members of Congress who has three children under the age of 10 years. It costs money to rear a family in these times. In these young people lies the future of America. It is essential that these young married couples should receive a salary sufficient to rear their families under decent and honorable conditions. By the elimination of the first five pay grades we would have gone a long way toward paying the starting postal employee a wage commensurate with the duties of postal employment. It is at least encouraging to know that the committee has not entirely discarded the idea of eliminating some of the lower pay grades at some time in the future.

I have heard on the floor of the House of some opposition to the retroactive features of the present bill. I have been trying since last March to get this bill out of committee for hearing. It seems to me that at this late date we would be unfair to the employees of the Post Office Department if we failed to give them some credit for the way in which they have patiently waited for this bill to be heard. Many of them have gone into debt over the past few months in order to make both ends meet. By the speeches on the floor today I can see that I am not alone in the correspondence received of the plight of some of these people. To allow this bill to be retroactive to July 1, we are in a small way compensating these men and women for the loyal service they have rendered in staying on the job and watching wages skyrocket in other civilian employment.

Is it not true that there is a definite responsibility upon this Congress to see that our Government employees are properly paid? You must remember that these people have no right to strike nor, for that matter, to collectively bargain for increased pay or working conditions. They sign such a pledge when they become employed by the Department. These employees have fulfilled their responsibility and now that responsibility is upon us to see that they receive some reward for their loyalty and devotion to our Government.

Not so long ago I received a letter from a postal employee at Champaign, Ill., enclosing a picture of two cute youngsters. The father writes me as follows:

These are my two best reasons for working and making a living. My take-home pay is \$55 a week and I have worked at the post office for over 3 years. I often wonder, Mr. SPRINGER, if Congressmen, like me, are slowly getting more first-of-the-month statements or getting bills with a "please" written on it or if you couldn't order any more coal because they still owed \$65. I wonder, too, if Congressmen had to shop at a little grocery up the street because they gave them credit from one day to the next or do without shoes themselves so their kids feet can stay dry. I wonder if a Congressman was trying to exist under those conditions if he would appreciate someone passing the buck when he was due for a raise.

I like my work and the conditions but the salary just won't make ends meet. I am not asking anything that I believe you wouldn't ask for under the same conditions. Thank you for reading this letter. Would you do us all a big favor and see if you can jack up this bill and give any help you can on this matter.

I have received hundreds of the same kinds of letters. Some are far more desperate than this one. Is it not time we get on the ball and see this bill passed today without any modifying or crippling amendments.

I have heard that later there will be introduced an amendment to do the same thing for rural carriers that this bill does for those in the postal field service. I sincerely hope the House will see fit to give those employees the same benefits. I can think of no reason why that should not be done.

The rural carrier is one of the oldest services in the postal field. There are still millions of people whose only access to the mail is the rural carrier who goes through the highways and byways to deliver to the rural people our mails.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will not just drop the matter of postal salaries as soon as this bill is passed. It has been almost 15 months since the cost of living began to rise. These employees are always at least a year behind when prices go up. In my opinion the fair thing for this committee to do is to keep under continuous study the cost of living and how it affects postal and civil-service employees, in order that we may give them increases promptly and not long after some of the employees have gone into debt. This is one of the constructive ways that the committee can help to make the Post Office Department a better place in which to work. Such action will also make the Department more attractive to good personnel that we want to see in the postal field.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the postal employees badly need, and are entitled to, pay raises which will bring their salaries more in line with living costs. The bill which we are today considering seeks to accomplish such objective. It does not, in my estimation, do so entirely. According to the best information which has been made avail-

able to me the bill should provide larger increases than it does. However, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in its wisdom, after full consideration of all the factors involved, has brought this measure to the floor. The committee spokesmen have assured us that the bill as presently drawn has the support of the majority of postal workers. If that is so, and I have no reason to doubt the fact, then I shall support the measure. If amendments are offered to improve the measure I shall support them also.

Mr. Chairman, the basis for my support of H. R. 244 is to be found in the countless letters which have been written to me by postal employees who have pointed out that their present pay does not enable them to meet living costs. Many of them have found it necessary to find part-time employment in addition to their regular work in order to supplement their income. The wives of many have been compelled to find employment also. Their standard of living has fallen below what it has been or should be. These employees who have served us faithfully and well throughout the years are entitled to receive better consideration and treatment at our hands. I sincerely trust that the House will pass this bill together with improving amendments, if any.

What I have had to say concerning postal employees applies with equal force to other Federal employees. Upon completion of our consideration on H. R. 244, two other measures dealing with the subject of pay increases for other employees will be taken up. I urge the House to give favorable consideration to these measures also.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman when the scale of pay raises granted to postal employees in recent years is compared with the increased costs of living, there can be no doubt that our postal employees have not received adequate pay increases which would allow them to maintain an adequate living standard for their families. And they are certainly entitled to an adequate raise now to bring their salaries in line with today's all-time high living costs.

The service we receive from the postal employees probably gives us the greatest value for our dollar that we can find today. For a few cents we can communicate with every section of our Nation to carry out business transactions or to contact our friends. The postal employees guarantee delivery regardless of the difficulties involved.

At the same time while the buying power of the dollar has shrunk continuously since the beginning of the Korean war, the postal employee has found his salary increasingly inadequate. The pay raise of \$120 which was granted to postal employees in 1949 was completely wiped out by increased prices within 6 months.

During this period with defense industries expanding and offering more lucrative employment, it has become increasingly difficult for the Post Office Department to fill vacancies with com-

petent personnel, especially with the present low starting grades within the postal service. And unless there is a pay adjustment now, many postal employees may find it necessary to leave the postal service and get jobs where the pay is better.

One postal employee wrote me recently:

We were better off 10 or 15 years ago with \$2,100 per year than we are today with nearly twice that much, with present income tax plus another 12½ percent increase in income tax and another 6 percent deducted for retirement, it is no longer a question of how much money you earn. It is what you can do with your take-home pay. Postal employees are usually sound, honest men who have heavy responsibilities maintaining a family and a decent home. This requires more than just a living wage, growing children entail many added expenses. We are badly in need of a generous increase.

This is typical of the many similar letters I have received reciting the difficulties faced by men in the postal service who simply cannot make ends meet with the present cost of living and inadequate pay. Some write that their wives must work to earn enough money to pay their bills, and that this disrupts their home life. Others cannot adequately care for their children, and cannot afford medical and dental attention.

The postal service is a vital and essential service to the people of this Nation. It is used by everyone, and the public certainly wants this service continued and its efficiency maintained.

The postal employees have always rendered loyal and sincere service to the United States. In spite of the enormous load placed on the postal service by the tremendous population increases in many sections of the country and the low pay rates, the postal employees have continued to work as hard and diligently as ever to deliver the mail on schedule.

An adjustment in the pay rates for our postal employees is certainly long overdue. And the postal employees are entitled to the increase in salary as provided in H. R. 244, which is now under consideration which will permit them to support their families and to maintain a reasonable standard of living. They have a right to consider the postal service as a career, and to feel secure in the knowledge that as long as they live up to the standard of that service they can expect to receive an adequate income for their labor.

I am supporting this bill which will put into circulation in the United States two hundred and thirty-five million seven hundred and sixty thousand more American dollars and benefit 497,542 loyal American citizens, all hard-working employees of the Post Office Department.

In view of the billions of American dollars we have appropriated for aid to foreign countries, the passage of this bill will be a healthy and beneficial indication that the United States Congress wants to take care of our own.

I have consistently urged speedy action by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in reporting the

postal employees pay bill to the House, and in my opinion it has taken too long to bring this important legislation before the House. I sincerely support this increase in postal employees pay now, and urge the Members of the House to pass this bill without further delay. I only hope that the action now taken by the Congress will not be too little and too late.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, many members of the committee and many Members of the House who would like to speak on this legislation have agreed that we will try to keep this debate short; we will try to keep it confined to essentials in order to accomplish expeditiously the job of getting these three pieces of legislation completed today, if it is at all possible.

I believe very definitely that any lengthy debate and argument is relatively unnecessary because throughout the length and breadth of this country, and in the Senate as already evidenced by its vote and as evidenced by the vote of the committee here, there is fairly unanimous agreement that these salary increases should be granted. There is some little difference as to the exact amounts and the effective dates, but these matters will be settled under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Chairman, may I take this moment to point out that in contacts with the people who use the mails I have found that 100 percent of them are willing to pay increased salaries to their public servants in the postal department for the job that is being done. The people of these United States recognize that in all other fields of endeavor the workers have received increased compensation in relative proportion to the increased cost of living.

The bill which we have before us today, because it has been so long delayed, will simply not grant an adjustment which is warranted by the facts and circumstances of our time; however, due to the total large cost, to provide adequate increases for all workers employed by the United States because that figure is large, we have perhaps been guilty here of holding down the amounts which each individual will receive below a point that is justified. I hope that in the very near future, in the next few hours, we will have completed this legislation, that we will have said to the employees of the United States that we are taking care in part of the increased cost of living which inflation has occasioned, and that we may further let those people know that to the limit of our ability to pay we will provide for our workers as the workers in private industry have been provided for.

I hope this bill passes substantially as it is and that we will send it to conference where the differences between the House and Senate may be promptly worked out, and the bill sent to the President for his assured signature.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to commend the gentleman on his remarks and to state that 2 months ago when I was home in the Calumet region of Indiana, the industrial area, I found that approximately 50 percent of the employees in the post offices of East Chicago, Ind., Hammond, Ind., and Gary, Ind., had resigned from the post office and now work in industry. This has thrown a great deal of extra work on the supervisors and on the postmasters because they are making every effort to break in these inexperienced and new employees and it is having a very serious effect on the efficiency of the postal service in those localities.

I want to commend the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing out this legislation. It is highly necessary, and I only wish that the retroactive feature could be included, because a great number of these postal employees in my area need this money to get out of debt.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman, and I believe the illustration he gave is typical rather than exceptional.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to point out, in connection with what the gentleman from Indiana said about borrowings in his community, that the same situation exists in New York City. The postal employees are borrowing in enormous numbers from the local agencies in my community and other communities, because they cannot make ends meet.

Mr. CORBETT. And they are spending it in anticipation, are they not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, with one major reservation, I am strongly for the bill under consideration. I think all of us recognize the tremendous increase in the cost of living that has swept the country and the need for rectifying that condition to the extent possible in the Federal service.

The major reservation that I have is based on this premise: I think that all of us, as indicated by our chairman earlier in this discussion, recognize the tremendous expenditure that this Government is making and is planning to make: Over \$60,000,000,000 for military preparedness, \$7,000,000,000 in foreign aid; somewhere in the neighborhood of \$25,000,000,000 for domestic expenditures. I think we are all seriously concerned about the economic future of this country.

This is the reservation that I have in the bill, and I will offer an amendment which I hope you will give consideration to at the proper time. It seems to me that there should be a cut-off point in the bill above which no increase in salary should be made, not because every individual has not felt the increased cost of living but because above a certain limit a man or woman can tighten belts

and can absorb the increased cost of living. I believe very strongly that every domestic economy that we can make should be made in the months ahead. The cut-off figure that I have set out in my amendment is \$7,500, which the classification schedule and the postal schedule show to be a logical cut-off point. Certainly in the lower classification grades, in the lower-salary groups, the need is greatest to offset the cost of living. From my own conscience standpoint, I think I would have great difficulty in going back to my own district and State and trying to justify to the people of Oklahoma and the Fifth District why I felt it necessary to raise by one penny the salary of a man or woman making \$7,500 a year, \$8,000, \$9,000, \$10,000, or \$13,000 a year, not that the cost of living has not gone up for them, as it has for you and me, but I think economy must be a keynote of everything we do on the domestic level. I hope you will give consideration to the amendment when it is introduced.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, this committee of which I am a member made a considerable study of the various departments of Government, seeking to curtail useless expenditures of public funds and seeking to cut down overstaffing of the various departments.

I think I should make this observation that in our study of those questions that are vital to the taxpayers of America that there was not a single member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that did not come to the conclusion that there was no overstaffing in the Post Office Department of this great country of ours, nor was there any waste of money. Our investigation revealed long faithful patriotic service on the part of postal employees. We came to the conclusion that all of these Federal employees that handle the vital stream of mail that goes out to our people work long hours, and that there are no surplus employees. The splendid address of our excellent chairman, when he gave you the salaries and grades of the various postal employees, must have convinced everybody that as far as the postal employees are concerned they are the lowest-paid employees of any department of our Federal Government. We have many very important departments of Government, but we have none that perform more essential duties for the general welfare of all the people than the Post Office Department.

The salaries for all time in the past since the birth of this Nation in the Post Office Department have been very low. You learned from the remarks of our distinguished chairman that the top salary is around \$4,000, unless a man spends a quarter of a century in this noble service, when he may get a few hundred dollars of longevity pay.

I feel that in justice to all the employees of the Post Office Department we should have a flat increase. There was submitted to our committee a number of recommendations, some coming from the Budget Director, some coming from the Post Office Department, and

some bills introduced by our colleagues, that undertook to handle this matter on a percentage basis. However, when we looked into the problem we found that the men and women in the service of this country that were receiving the lowest pay and that were in the greatest need of a cost-of-living increase were the ones that would profit least by a percentage increase, and that those who were receiving higher salaries were the ones that would profit most by a general increase in their pay, on a percentage basis.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to commend my colleague from Kentucky on his statement, and to say that I am in agreement with his views. Further, I think this legislation is necessary because the postal employees are all necessary employees and because those employees are underpaid. There is no group of employees more faithful than the postal workers and carriers. Some fourth-class postmasters are now being paid as little as \$264 per year. The postmasters are entitled to the 20-percent increase provided for in this bill, and inasmuch as Congress has delayed the passage of this legislation, I certainly think the retroactive provision is justifiable. I certainly hope there will be no votes against this needed legislation on final passage.

Mr. GOLDEN. I thank my colleague from Kentucky for his contribution. If we adopt this measure that received such long and careful consideration by the committee we will be giving to our postal employees about half of the increased costs they have had to assume in the last 3 or 4 years on account of the rising cost of living. We are still demanding of them certain sacrifices, which they through their patriotism are willing to assume.

Concerning the pay of the fourth-class postmasters, I think my good State of Kentucky has as many and possibly more fourth-class postmasters than any State in the Union. There are more than 1,700 small postmasters in that State. I think the fourth-class postmasters are paid less than any of the other postal employees. We have taken care of that situation by granting to them a 20-percent increase in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, to show the many duties that are performed by the postmasters of the United States, I include in my remarks the following letter from Mr. Taylor, the postmaster at Coldiron, Ky., who understands these problems and explains the useful service to all our people that the postmasters of America perform:

JULY 30, 1951.

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN,
Ninth Kentucky Representative,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In answer to your letters of information relative to the Civil Service Committee's consideration of certain bills intended to raise or adjust the salaries of postal and other Federal employees, I wish to give you briefly, some facts describing the labor and time spent in the post office at Coldiron (Harlan County), Ky.

I was appointed postmaster at Coldiron January 16, 1935, and at that time spent about 6 hours in the post office per day. Compensation averaged at that time about \$35 per month.

In the fiscal year of 1950, my annual salary was \$1,329.61. We are required to keep the office open 7 hours daily. When you figure the hourly rate, I make about 45 cents per hour, plus 3 cents for each money order issued. The minimum hourly wage law is 75 cents per hour. No other employee in any capacity is underpaid like the fourth-class postmaster in America.

During the fiscal year 1950, we issued 2,041 money orders at a total cash value of \$22,471.28 and money order fees were \$322.65. We registered 264 letters, insured 261 packages, paid 143 money orders; besides all that, mailed approximately 200 additional parcels, thousands of first-class mail, received hundreds of packages, thousands of letters, cards, second- and third-class mail, addressed dozens of letters for those who were unable to write, filled out GI and veteran papers, completed forms for birth certificates, social security, and income tax, gave information concerning the address of proper agency to write relative to the various services offered by our Government and others, filled out hundreds of the applications for money orders for children and others who could not fill them out—assisted patrons in properly packing, wrapping, and tying parcels for mailing and even addressed some of the parcels, and sometimes we even have to lick the stamp and put them on the letters for some patrons.

In fact, there's not a group of people anywhere in America employed by the Government or any one else that assumes the responsibility and does so much work for so little. The fourth-class postmaster is located in the small towns and rural communities where he is expected to perform practically all services except spiritual and physical services and sometimes he or she is expected to render that service.

With these facts before you, our servants, who represent all the people of America, I leave it with you to use your best judgment in arriving at a fair compensation and adjustment for the fourth-class postmaster.

May I say, in closing, that my voice, I believe, speaks for every fourth-class postmaster in the employment of the good old United States of America. I request this letter to be presented to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate.

Sincerely, your friend,
CLAUDE M. TAYLOR.

They are a necessary, helpful, and useful part of every community. They speed the safe delivery of letters between families and friends and promote the business of all our people. Every man and woman who works hard and faithfully and renders essential service should receive adequate pay and compensation. This bill does this and I recommend that it be passed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in accord with this legislation. As a matter of fact, there is one point which does not show. Every year the postal employees in each grade receive a \$100 increase. That legislation was passed some years ago. If we compare \$100 today with what \$100 was worth at that time, we would find the differences around \$250. The legislation we are considering today is very important. First of all, in Detroit in a

year's time, we find that over 1,300 employees have quit the post office for various reasons, to go to other jobs, for more pay and so forth. If we are to look ahead and to be assured that the Post Office Department is properly staffed, it is very vital that this legislation be passed. I have maintained, and always will maintain, that proper work requires proper pay. If you want to have mediocre pay, you will receive mediocre work. Postmaster Donaldson stated, himself, that although he proposes the cost of living increase of 10 percent, but 21 percent would be more like it. The reason for that is that 50 percent of the wage of the lowest paid employee goes for food. The price of food has taken quite a jump. We all know that. The \$700 increase for the starting point is very meritorious. Let us look the thing over. The starting point today for carriers is \$2,670. A living wage for any person who intends to start a family should not be below \$3,500. This bill provides an additional \$700 for the starting point, which brings it up to \$3,370, which is still short of \$3,500. We must either give the postal employees a proper wage so that they can maintain their standard of living or we must expect a deterioration in the type of service that the Post Office Department has rendered to the people in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take the time of the House in discussing the provisions of this measure, the provisions of which have been adequately explained by other proponents.

I would simply reiterate what I have said previously on the floor and in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee that I strongly support increased pay for postal workers, those who do the actual work and carry the burden of serving the public. This increase to these workers is long overdue.

And I want to make it plain that I support the retroactive feature. I suggest to those who oppose retroactive pay to July 1 that if this bill had received the early attention that it should it would have been passed in mid-year and made effective so that there would have been no question of retroactivity.

Those in the low-pay brackets of the postal service are in need of help, and they need it now. I am but little concerned with Government workers in the high brackets. In the past this administration, while giving lip service to the little people, has rushed through pay increases for those in the top brackets. It is time to stop this subterfuge and help those who need it most.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, despite some differences of opinion in our committee, it is obvious from this discussion that we did arrive at certain conclusions with regard to the basic provisions of the bill, under the splendid

leadership of our chairman and minority leader on the committee. The differences of opinion are being reconciled, I think, in this very discussion which we are now carrying on.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Could the gentleman briefly state why the committee did not include an appropriate increase for rural carriers in connection with this legislation?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would rather refer the gentleman from Arkansas to the senior member of the committee.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. They are so included.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure the question will be fully answered in due time.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman says they are included, so I suppose they are.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understood there was to be an amendment offered to this bill, and I thought he referred to the amendment.

Mr. BURNSIDE. They are included.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I support this bill because I think it helps attack the whole problem of better treatment for postal employees. We have heard from members of the committee the necessity for an increase in postal pay. Of course we are agreed upon that, despite any differences of opinion in regard to amounts. Frankly, having watched the progress of the other body, I would much prefer that we take the Senate bill and substitute it for our deliberations here and pass it and get it over with today. But since that does not seem to be practical at the present time, let me just mention one thing from my experience; since we began to discuss this bill many months ago.

I know of no better way to get information on a matter of this kind than to see, first-hand as a reporter, and to hear first-hand, the reports of people actually affected by such legislation as this. Therefore, I began to visit post offices and talk to postal employees. I called conferences of the postmaster, some supervisors, and representatives of other personnel in post offices, including clerks and carriers, whether the post office was large or small. Always I asked the same question and almost always I got the same answers.

I started these conferences in my home town of Springfield, Mo., which is a typical midwestern small city of about 70,000. I visited smaller post offices in my district and other districts. Then into the larger cities, which included St. Louis, Mo.; San Francisco, Calif.; Indianapolis, Ind., and Asheville, N. C., which certainly furnish a cross-section of the medium and larger cities in this country. Postal employees were unanimous in telling me certain things. First, that we were losing good personnel from the postal service, and that it is difficult to recruit good personnel to take the place of those they lose. As a result, there is a lowering of the entire standard of personnel in the Post Office

Department. Most of these things have been mentioned already, but let me emphasize them. Unanimously I was informed that these postal workers, particularly in the larger cities, cities of the size of Kansas City, Denver, Louisville, Newark, and on up to the largest, are faced with three conditions:

First, our postal employees are having to get extra work in order to make ends meet. Second, and this has not been mentioned before in this discussion today, the wives of our clerks and carriers and other personnel are having to get work in order to add to the family income. Many of those families—most of them, I dare say—have children that need those mothers at home.

The third has already been mentioned: More than half of them have had to borrow on the credit of their next pay check or on their general credit.

I say that adequate pay will not solve all of these problems with which we are confronted in rebuilding the standards of our postal service and personnel, but certainly the problem will never be solved without adequate pay.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that this legislation is certainly a step in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill H. R. 244. This bill had a unanimous report from the committee. The committee has worked very hard on this bill for many, many months. It is nice that we have come out with a unanimous report.

I wish to compliment the committee and the workers on our staff. They have done an excellent job. They have cooperated in every way with both the majority and the minority. I wish to compliment them for the excellent work they have done on this bill. To the postal workers this raise has been long overdue. For that reason I thought it was wise that it be made retroactive to the first of July.

Answering other questions, rural carriers are covered under section 2 (a) on page 9 of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The purpose of my inquiry to the gentleman from Missouri was because the gentlewoman from New York in her statement a few minutes ago said she understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] was going to propose an amendment to include rural carriers. Some of us thought rural carriers were included, and the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia now assures us that rural carriers are included.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I may not have expressed myself entirely correctly in

leaving the impression that they were not included. What I meant to say was that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] was going to offer an amendment which to my way of thinking would improve the status of rural carriers under the bill and that I was going to support the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to have the clarification of the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H. R. 244 and my purpose is to make certain comparisons between the Government as an employer and privately operated business.

In the city of Anderson, Ind., in the Fifth District which I have the honor to represent, there are two shining examples which contrast a Government-operated business and a privately operated business. The one is a very large post-office building which renders an excellent service to the community and the other is a very large industrial plant owned by General Motors Corp. which furnishes electrical and lighting equipment to automobiles.

I know most of the employees in the post office and I also know many employees in the several General Motors plants which are located in the same city. In fact, I have talked with quite a few of them and it has been very easy to determine which plant operated with the greatest efficiency and which plant paid the most attention to its employees.

Under date of June 13, 1951, there was published an edition of the Delco-Remy Clan, a weekly paper by and for the employees of the Delco-Remy division of General Motors. Let us read some of the headlines and articles in this house organ which indicate the advantages that the General Motors employees have over those employees in the United States Post Office.

On page 2, one headline is "Education plans train hundreds for better jobs—For more than a quarter of a century Delco-Remy has been giving young men a helping hand to improve themselves through a variety of educational and in-plant training programs." What does the Post Office do to train their employees for better jobs?

On the same page, another heading "Safety, medical facilities occupy top spots in employee programs." This article discusses the medical facilities which include bed dispensaries, a staff of physicians and nurses, X-ray equipment, whirlpool therapy, and similar minor surgery equipment. It is reported that each month some 23,000 treatments are administered for both occupational and nonoccupational ailments. Last year the company furnished more than \$20,000 worth of drugs, and X-ray pictures were made of the employees. What does the Post Office do for the health of its employees?

On page 3 another heading, "Two thousand three hundred and fifty promoted within year." Of course, all of these men in Delco-Remy did not receive

top positions but they were advanced and many have come up from the ranks. They want to feel that the chances for advancement are unlimited and that those who are willing to work for their advancement should have the opportunity of doing so. What does the Post Office Department do toward promotions?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I think I can correct one statement there; the Postmaster General has put in a training program.

Mr. BEAMER. May I continue? Because this brings out another point. This is not criticism, understand; I want to bring out a very definite point in favor of the postal employees.

On page 6, the heading is "ideas pay \$31,662.39 in 5 months—Awards presented for improvements range from \$10 to \$2,500." Everything is done to encourage the submission of ideas and, in fact, in that particular period, 3,192 ideas were submitted and 520 produced results that actually paid the employee some money. Ask any postal employee what happens if he submits ideas.

Another heading on this page, "Cafeterias, washrooms are two of many conveniences." Cafeterias in this large General Motors plant offer the best food in town at a very low price. In fact it is operated for the benefit of the employees of the plant. The washrooms are clean, roomy, and comfortable. What does the Post Office do in these two respects?

I am bringing these things to your attention because I think it is so very vitally important that we give consideration to the demands and requests of these people.

Page 7 indicates that even entertainment is provided. Al Schacht, the clown prince of baseball, was on hand at the opening of their baseball game.

Another heading on this page, "Recreational program on year-round basis." Four major sports are encouraged—baseball, golf, bowling and basketball. How and where does the postal employee get his recreation?

On page 8, another heading "Various insurance programs sponsored by division provide low-cost protection." Delco-Remy's insurance program covered by two large established companies, provides death, sickness and accident, doctors' hospital calls, and permanent disability protection. Low rates are secured and Delco-Remy shares a portion of the cost and provides all the administrative help necessary to the operation of the details. What does the Post Office do for the insurance and health of its employees?

Another heading on this page, "Pension plans offer veteran employees additional security for retirement." There are contributory and noncontributory plans which make it possible for employees, after a certain length of service or upon arriving at a certain age, to retire. At the time of this publication, 99 of the plant employees had retired with their pensions. A picture illustrates a postal carrier delivering a pension check to a Delco-Remy retired employee. It is

doubtful that the postal carrier could retire and live on his pension.

This contrast could continue endlessly. To the question being asked, "Why has the present administration given so much attention to the employees of a large industrial plant and so little to the Federal employees who contribute of their time and efforts in Government service?" the answer seems rather obvious. The employees in the large industrial plant still have the American right to organize and to freely speak their minds on national issues.

The present administration knows that the postal employees are controlled by the Hatch Act from making any public utterances of a political nature. Apparently the administration feels that they cannot be counted upon as a potential voting force, and, therefore, there was this long delay which does not occur in privately operated industries. I hope that these deserving postal employees will receive the same consideration that their friends in private industry are accorded.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITAKER].

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Chairman, everybody is for this bill which is for those who need it. What we have done is looking out for the little fellow. The limitation is \$800. The entire committee passed unanimously upon the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. It is perhaps because my father served for 20 years as postmaster in a small Missouri town, and I worked in that office as a youngster, that I have a natural sympathy for all postal employees. However, I do not think I am prejudiced in favoring them over any other group of our citizens. We all know the responsibility and necessary functions that they perform and this legislation, as was stated a moment ago by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE], is long overdue. I want to congratulate the chairman and the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing in this very meritorious legislation.

Mr. WHITAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill as it has been reported, and particularly for the retroactive feature. Some months ago when the question of the great need of the employees of the Post Office Department was raised, and it was suggested that we speed up the legislation beyond the point where we could consider it as carefully as we should in reference to certain features, the suggestion of making it retroactive to the first of January or some point back in the early part of the year was made. Then it was discovered, I believe through suggestion from the Bureau of

the Budget, that it would confuse the bookkeeping of the Government and make it more difficult if it were made retroactive beyond the first day of July, the beginning of the fiscal year. While there was no record action of the committee, it was generally agreed among the members at that time, and without a dissenting voice—to have more deliberate committee action because of the fact that we are going to make the bill retroactive to the beginning of this fiscal year. I think it would be much less than justice to these people who have served so faithfully if we do not make this law retroactive at least to that point. That is, the point that has been fixed in the reported bill.

I was impressed many years ago, perhaps the first time I went to New York, with the legend over the old Post Office Building which said:

Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

This, of course, referred to the postal employees. But there are obstacles which have deterred and have stayed these swift couriers in recent years. One of them is the fact that the post office system itself has grown faster than the appreciation of it by the Government and by the people generally. The post office system is the greatest operating business in the world. It is something which affects the lives of more people than any other part of our Government, and affects them more often. We have taken great pride in it and we have to continue to have great pride in this organization, because it comes so close to us. We cannot do that without proper supervision. The supervisors and the people in the upper brackets of the Post Office Department are people who have come up through the ranks. It is almost necessarily so. They have been recruited from the ranks. But today the intake in the lower grades of the Post Office is so restricted and so inadequate that if we do not cut these lower grades off; if we do not take in capable types of people in the bottom, we will not have people to run this great business. We do not expect the Postmaster General, the executive vice president of this biggest operating corporation in the world, or what would be comparable to that, to get a salary comparable with private business, but we do have to pay these people in the lower brackets something in the way comparable to what they can get in industry or we cannot continue to operate this great Post Office business in the interest of the people. It is so vital that we pass this bill, it seems to me, that this committee has deliberated on and has reported out. It is so vital that we pass it as reported, not only in simple justice to the employees of the Post Office Department, but in the interest of this great organization that serves more American people every day than all other arms of the Government combined.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the Committee is presently considering an amendment to House bill 244. Do I understand the procedure to be that the amendment will be read by the Clerk, and after being read, will be subject to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is hereby amended in the following respects:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the committee amendment be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) each section of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended and supplemented, which provides annual automatic pay grades for positions in the postal field service is amended (1) by striking out the grade designations and rates of compensation provided for grades 1, 2, and 3, and (2) by renumbering respectively, beginning with the No. 1, in the same sequence in which they appear on the day before the effective date of this section, those grades which are on such day higher than grade 3. Any references to pay grades higher than grade 3 and any references with respect to the total number of grades in any class of position which are contained in such act or in any other law are hereby renumbered to conform to the changes made by this subsection.

"(b) Each employee who, on the day before the effective date of this section, is in grade 1, grade 2, or grade 3 shall as of such effective date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 by subsection (a).

"(c) Each employee on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this act for whom annual automatic pay grades are provided by the act of July 6, 1945, as amended and supplemented, who entered the postal field service after June 30, 1945, and who has not been advanced at least two annual automatic pay grades pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, section 2 of the act of March 6, 1946, as amended (Public Law 317, 79th Cong.), the act of July 31, 1946, as amended (Public Law 577, 79th Cong.), and section 2 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the act of October 28, 1949, as amended (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.), shall be advanced two annual automatic pay grades, or, if such employee has been advanced one annual automatic pay grade pursuant to such provisions of law, he shall be advanced one annual automatic pay grade. Any such advancement in grade of an employee under this subsection shall be effective as of the effective date of this act and shall not be considered as a promotion for purposes of determining the date on which such employee is eligible for a promotion to the next higher grade.

"(d) Section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service,' approved October 28, 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 2. (a) Each postmaster, officer, and employee in the postal field service whose rate of compensation is prescribed by such act of July 6, 1945, as amended and supplemented (including amendments made by the first section of this act), shall receive additional compensation at the rate of \$400 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 20 percent of their basic annual compensation.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

"Sec. 3. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of this act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in the case of employees in the postal field service who transfer or are transferred to positions within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"Sec. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of July 1, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to reduce the number of grades for positions in the postal field service and to provide salary increases for personnel in such service."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Committee Members who are for this bill have made an excellent case for it. There is one point that has not been made that I think is very important. The original bill, when it was introduced, provided for a 17-percent-pay increase, if that had been done it would have resulted in a typical category like postal clerks' salaries, in raising their pay commensurate with the rise in the consumers' cost of living, and provided for increases more comparable with the rises which have taken place in the wages of factory and similar workers since 1939. Postal clerks had salary increases making their average salaries about 166.7 percent of 1939. During this same period the consumers' price index of the Department of Labor—1939=100—has gone up to 185.4. On this basis a 17-percent increase would have been just about right to enable the postal clerks to keep up. The committee has not done that.

The committee has really brought in a package bill, as has been said here a number of times, combining a pay increase, elimination of certain lower

grades, and adjusted compensation to people who came in after the war who were not called because of war services.

The point that I would like to leave with the committee, and which I think every Member should think of as these amendments come up, which endeavor to cut out this or cut out that, and nibble away at this bill—like a fair retroactivity provision—is the fact that the committee has arrived at a compromise which is in balance. We should, insofar as we humanly can, if we want to be fair to the postal workers, keep all parts of this package bill together and pass this bill just as the committee, which has spent so much time and effort on it and has balanced it in all its detail, has brought it to us.

There is one fundamental point about the compensation of postal workers we must all remember. They cannot strike. They cannot engage in collective bargaining. Their opportunities are limited. They cannot go out and find other jobs. The post office is their career. We, the Congress, are their bosses. It seems to me it calls on our part for our finest powers of judgment and equity, indeed, for a kind of human understanding which I think the committee has brought to the package bill that it was brought in and now asks us to adopt. We must see that the justice of the Nation is done, that salaries and conditions of postal workers are commensurate with responsibilities, with prevailing salaries and wages, with tenure of service, with merit and with the special conditions surrounding their lack of the comparable opportunities afforded by private employment.

I hope very much that the Committee of the Whole will turn down these nibbling amendments and will pass the bill just as the committee brought it to us.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The morale of the average postal worker in the United States today is at an unfortunate low. This bill will go far to raise that morale.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee to the committee amendment: On page 8, strike out beginning with line 14 down through line 9 on page 9, and on page 9, line 10, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is the so-called fringe benefit provision that I referred to in my opening statement. This not only gives certain postal employees a \$400 increase, of which I am in favor, but it also gives them an additional grade of either \$100 or an additional two grades of \$200, which will make these 150,000 employees get a \$500 or \$600 increase rather than the \$400 increase. The total cost of this special benefit and gratuity to these employees will be \$28,410,000.

These employees have been insisting that they should be given these gratuitous or bonus grades because when Public Law 134 was passed, the law, which was reported out by our committee, provided that instead of giving a general increase to postal employees we just gave them four more grades. It was equivalent to \$400. We could have given them a \$400 increase, but they were making \$1,700 as a starting salary and \$2,100 as a maximum, so it was really an increase of \$400, not four grades. I do not think these employees are entitled to this extra benefit.

Let me speak about another benefit. These employees in addition to the \$400 carried in this bill will get a \$100 automatic promotion sometime within the year, so they will get \$500 under this bill if you strike out this section giving them these extra benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this is an unpleasant task, it is a hopeless task, but I am satisfying my conscience. I know I am right in my judgment about this matter. I know I am treating the employees right when I ask you to eliminate this bonus.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and will also oppose elimination of the provision to date the increase from July 1.

I wish to state to the Congress that the committee has passed on this bill, and, from my examination, I believe brought out a fair package bill. The bill should be looked at as a whole, and as a unit. As has been said previously, you start knocking off one little item here and one little item there, you are going to have ramifications that the Congress cannot follow in this short period of time.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TACKETT. Will the gentleman explain what the fringe benefits are that the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned?

Mr. FULTON. I will refer that to the gentleman from Tennessee. Was not the gentleman listening when the gentleman from Tennessee was speaking, and has he not read the committee report and the minority views?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. This situation, as most of us understand, has to do with those who came into the service immediately following the bill which the Congress passed.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman from Oklahoma wants an explanation of that specific item, there has been no increase in the last raise bill to the employees who came in since 1945.

Mr. CORBETT. Most of those individuals are war veterans who came back from World War II and were not given the benefit of the \$400 increase, which had been passed in the previous fiscal year. So they started in at \$400 less. This provision does the same as the Senate provision, and simply corrects half of that difference. But, if they did re-

ceive one grade increase, they will get \$100 here, and if they did not receive any grade increase, they will get \$200, whereas they feel they should have been entitled to the \$400 increase.

Mr. FULTON. I am against deleting that or any other provision in the bill, which the committee has passed on, and which a majority of the committee has approved and reported.

May I refer again to what the chairman of the committee said when he was arguing in general debate. He had cited that there were certain professional people in his home State such as teachers with a master's degree who were getting \$258 a month when they came out of school and took their teaching jobs. In addition to that, he said certain teachers in his home-town community of Jackson, Tenn., which we will agree is a good community, as we all do, receive \$300 a month after 14 years of service although they have masters' degrees. Of course, that rate of pay cannot be said to be the rule for the whole country. It is a specific case. If it is possible to get people of that grade in Tennessee, with a profession, for that amount of money, it certainly is not the rule for the country and should not be a make-weight or argument in this case when we are dealing with our postal people all over the country. Exceptional specific instances should not be used for the purpose of making general rules, and especially where the number of people are involved that are being taken care of under this bill. It is wrong to pay that amount in Tennessee, or any place throughout the country, for professional people who have masters' degrees. Two wrongs, by adding another wrong of recommending such action for the postal employees, will not make a right.

Further, this is one place where the public and the taxpayers are getting full value for their money, the post office employees give us our money's worth and more. I am in favor of a good day's work for a good day's pay. We are not giving this postal pay raise money away in grants to foreign countries; these are pay raises to our own hard-working people who have earned them. In addition to that, the pay raise is on the basis of a cost-of-living increase, and the cost-of-living increase is just the same for those people who have come in since 1945 and hits them the same as it hits the other people in the postal service. Shortly after the debate on this amendment is over, I believe we should have a motion that the committee do now rise and report the bill for final passage. Such motion will give the Congress a chance to vote on the committee bill and send it right out for final passage as it is, rather than go through all these amendments and take up a great deal of time. It is going to be a case of either backing the committee and backing the committee bill or else voting it down and hacking at the bill by amendments here, and hacking at it there by more amendments. So, if someone will introduce the amendment for assisting rural carriers, we can then have a decision on

the bill, and decide whether we want it in its present form and get it over with, and then pass on the other two bills to be taken up this afternoon. The good postal workers are entitled to quick action on this pay-raise bill, after the months of delay it has encountered reaching the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand this section, when World War II began thousands of men who were on the eligible register were called into the service. After their time in the service they came home and went to work in the post office and they received no credit for the time they spent in the service. Men who had not gone into the service would be a number of salary grades ahead of the veteran. This same injustice took place in World War I and was corrected after World War I. As I understand it, this section merely corrects an injustice that has been done many employees, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the situation. He is entirely erroneous in his position. This does not affect any present postal employee who was on the eligible roll when he went into the service in World War II. They were taken care of by the McCormack Act, and they were entitled to be, because they had taken an examination and were on the eligible list before they were called into service. After they came back they were given the benefits of Public Law 134. These men were given those benefits and they were never on the eligible list until they were discharged and came back home.

Mr. TEAGUE. If I had taken an examination and was on the register and I went into the service and came home and went to work for the postal department, I would not receive credit for the time I spent in the service. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes; that is correct; from the time you were offered a job.

Mr. TEAGUE. But I was not offered a job. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is completely mistaken in what he is saying, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee to the committee amendment: On page 10, strike out lines 10 to 21, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which commences after the date of its enactment."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the committee bill before you provides that this salary increase shall be retroactive to July 1, 1951. My amendment is to strike out that date and make this increase effective on the first day of the following month after the month when the act is approved.

There are three bills to be considered: the postal salary bill, the reclassification bill for postmasters and supervisors, and the bill for classified employees. Those three bills will cost \$675,000,000. All of them have a retroactive date to July 1. If my amendment is adopted for each of these bills, you will save \$225,000,000. It has always been customary for salary bills to become effective on the first day of the month after they were approved and became law.

I know the House is not going to approve my amendment, but I want to give some of you who have been clamoring about our heavy expenditures and trying to cut down nondefense expenditures a chance to express yourselves. I have my record. I have supported the Jensen amendment every time it was proposed on an appropriation bill. I have tried to fight for economy. I have tried to be fair to the employees, but I have a duty and a responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. While I know I am fighting a losing fight, I know my conscience is clear in making this fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I consider it only my duty to speak in support of this long-pending legislation to afford an equitable increase in compensation to our faithful postal employees. I particularly urge you, my colleagues, to accept and approve the provision making this measure retroactive to July.

As you all realize, this bill has been held in the committee since April of 1950, and it is a matter of regret to me, and I know to a great many other Members, that we were not permitted to act upon it before this late date.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to repeatedly appear before the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees, during these past 4 years, to testify on the various proposals for elimination of the salary injustices prevailing among the Postal Department employees, as well as all Federal employees, whose wage scales lagged seriously behind the advances afforded in the comparable fields of industry.

I am not going to unduly take the time of this House, at this hour, to recite in detail the changing economic conditions which have materially reduced the buying power of the purchasing dollar in the hands of the American wage earners today. The committee hearings particularly revealed the present existence of economic factors which gravely handicap our postal employees in their strug-

gle to maintain a decent living level of life for themselves and their families. No one will be bold enough to deny there is a pressing and urgent need for equitable pay adjustment to raise the living standards of our postal workers.

With special reference to these employees, I submit that their universally recognized devotion and industry in their work on behalf of their country deserves the gratitude, respect, and admiration of all other citizens.

In this connection, I deeply believe it is very timely pertinent to point out and remind you that, if this Government is to uphold the tradition of honest service, administered by loyal personnel, it must offer our employees wages comparable to other occupations of the same nature in private industry.

The best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend them a fair living wage. It is only ordinary common sense and recognition of the facts of life that if our Government employees are sufficiently compensated to enable them to meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist ideas.

I urge you, therefore, in simple justice, to approve this measure to provide these salary increases to our faithful postal employees without further delay.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I cannot permit to go unchallenged this effort to cut out the retroactive feature in this measure. As a matter of fact, as was very well stated by the gentleman from Indiana, at the time this was considered there were a great many members of the committee who wanted to make this retroactive feature applicable January 1, 1951. The retroactive date as of July 1, 1951, was a compromise. As a matter of fact, we speak of the increases postal employees have had. When that is analyzed we find that the postal employees have had no substantial increase in their wages since 1948. We find that in 1949 they received under Public Law 428 of the Eighty-first Congress an increase in pay of \$120 a year; and the hourly employees received an increase of 2½ cents per hour. Under that act the fourth class postmasters received a 5-percent increase. The other increases were in regard to those who went into the service many years ago and allowed them an additional \$200 a year. It was admitted at that time that the increase in wages granted to postal employees was entirely inadequate to compensate for the high cost of living at that time. So we come here today with this very nominal, very conservative increase in wages for postal employees, with a retroactive date as of July 1, 1951, and immediately there is a plea on the part of some few Members that the taxpayers of this great country were being sacrificed to benefit postal employees.

I think this is an absurd and unfair position, particularly in view of the fact

that we are giving to foreign countries huge sums to raise their standards of living. It would be well if we paid more attention to our own people and their welfare.

I wish the hearings were printed, for then you could read the graphic picture of the postal service; high officials, not only representatives of the men but representatives of the postal service testifying before the committee as to the declining morale in the service; likewise that employees were seeking employment outside the postal service in order to increase the family revenue so they might maintain a decent standard of living.

Furthermore, former Congressman Ramspeck, today Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, appeared before the committee and testified that there should be an increase in wages. He testified that were the increase in wages brought up to meet the high cost of living, the cost of living index at the present time, it would have to be about 20 percent, but that it was not practical to give that much of an increase at this time. That came from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Certainly these faithful employees are entitled to an increase to be made retroactive to July 1, 1951, certainly they are not at fault for the delay in the passage of this legislation, and therefore certainly they should not be penalized for it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the gentleman believe that unless this bill is made retroactive, before the year is out these representatives of the postal employees will be coming back to our committee and asking for a further increase?

Mr. WITHROW. That will be absolutely necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the July 1 date was just a compromise? That date should stand, in view of the fact that this Congress, not the postal workers, was at fault because we just have not had time to get at this bill sooner.

Mr. WITHROW. Yes; the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. I am going to vote for this bill without crippling amendments. I think it would be a great mistake on the part of this committee and of the House to strike out the retroactive feature. Congress should have passed this bill over a year ago. During the recent recess I spent some time at home and interviewed a number of postal employees. I was surprised to learn of the low morale in the postal service due to the fact that the wage scale is insufficient to support the men and their families. The service is losing its best men because the salaries are insufficient to support the postal employees and their families.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I hope the amendment will be defeated decisively.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Murray amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my high esteem of the postal employees; I know that they are a fine patriotic group of Government employees. I am their friend, and they know it.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain the postal employees would be satisfied to take a \$400 annual increase without this retroactive clause.

This is not a pleasant task which I am attempting to perform here, but I am sure nobody in this House or out of this House can truthfully say that the postal employees are not willing to suffer to this extent, because of the terrific expenditure which the taxpayers of the Nation must bear, the postal employees themselves being a part of the taxpayers of this Nation.

I am also very sure that very, very few postal employees would hold it against any of us, if we pass this bill as it has been reported with a \$400 annual pay increase, without going back and paying him or her for all they have already done, since it is not common practice for Congress to make pay raises retroactive, as all of you well know.

I shall support this bill regardless of whether this pending amendment is adopted or not, because I feel the postal employees are entitled to this increase.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman stated that he is certain the post-office employees would not want the retroactive feature in this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not say just that.

Mr. KLEIN. I am sorry.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not say it in so many words as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. KLEIN. Will the gentleman repeat his statement to the effect he believes the postal employees would be satisfied?

Mr. JENSEN. Would be satisfied, yes.

Mr. KLEIN. Has the gentleman spoken to any employee or to any representative of any employee group?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not have to speak to them. I know them well. I know what is in their hearts.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee the first two sessions I served in this House, and I learned something about the postal employees, their loyalty, and their efforts in doing their job well. The postal employees as a general rule do more for their pay than the employees of most any other department of Government. There may be a few exceptions in the smaller branches of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Murray amendment will be adopted. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is always fair right down the line in his treatment toward his fellow man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take all of my time. I do not understand why we have not limited debate on this amendment. I just rise to briefly point out that every single piece of mail and every presentation that I have had from many individual postal employees or from any organized group of postal employees has vigorously urged that the retroactive feature be maintained.

I want to make the further statement that I believe very sincerely that had we been able to bring about this pay increase last January or February, which would still have been months after the fourth round of pay increases for private employees, perhaps no retroactive feature would be justified. But now here in the fall of 1951, more than a year after the inflationary forces threaten our economy, we are just getting around to the job of adjusting salaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman states that every letter he has received from a postal employee advocates making this pay increase retroactive. I just wonder if the gentleman has received any letters from any taxpayers, other than a postal employee or a member of his family asking that this be made retroactive. How does the general public feel about making this retroactive?

Mr. CORBETT. I will say to the gentleman that from the very small number of communications from persons not directly involved, they have agreed that the retroactive feature is fair. But I cannot emphasize that there has been a great number.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not a fact that this is one of the direct services that the taxpayer gets for his tax dollar, and that the taxpayer at large is willing to pay for this pay raise for the postal employees?

Mr. CORBETT. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. As he knows, I send out a questionnaire about every 3 months to the people of my district, and it would amaze the gentleman, as it did me, to find that 70 percent of the people who signed replies, well over 3,000, agreed that they were willing to pay 4 cents first-class postage rate and 2 cents on postal cards to bring about the increase.

Mr. MORANO. Of course.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have all talked about an increase for postal employees since the first of the year. The original bill H. R. 244 called for 17 percent across the board. The increase as it stands today is approximately 11 percent, which is still a far cry from 17 percent that it originally was. The postal employees have worked hard and have waited a long time for this increase. As has been pointed out previously, it was a compromise not to bring it back to January 1 of this year but to July 1 of 1951.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Was it not nearly a unanimous report by the committee?

Mr. LESINSKI. It certainly was.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. Is it not also a fact that the postal employees of this country have been led to believe through the newspapers that this bill would be passed and that it probably would become effective July 1, and that is why it is only fair that we should make it retroactive now?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is true. The fact is that the bill, in all respect to anyone, was heard thoroughly in the committee, and it took longer than expected. So the point is, as was pointed out previously, we made it July 1, in all fairness to the employees of the Post Office Department. I do not think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of participating in this debate because I think much too much has been said and much too little has been done so far, but a note has been introduced which I think requires an answer, namely, the note of the necessity for a little patriotism on the part of the postal employees. I think the postal employees have already demonstrated their patriotism by staying on the job when their pay was so far under what it should have been for a long time.

I think the retroactivity clause must be kept in the bill, because the Post Office employees have borrowed from the Postal Employees Credit Union in Detroit much more than they can ever repay on the basis of the promises and assurances made by this Congress that this raise, and more than we are giving them today, would be given to them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the climax of a long fight on the part of post office employees and Members of Congress friendly to their cause. I appreciate this opportunity to say today that I am for the retroactive pay. It was our responsibility to pass this bill early in the year and it is our responsibility today to see that these postal employees get what is coming to them despite our procrastination and delay. I think we ought to make the bill retroactive further back than July 1. Make it a year, if you want to. At any rate, I think we are doing the right thing here today. We are raising the postal employees.

There is a man back home that I know who has five children. He has to go out

and peddle papers on Sunday in order to make up the family budget, in order to feed his family. He is a postal employee. He ought to have a raise. He ought to have a chance to balance his budget.

This raise should be as music to the ears of our postal workers after so long a struggle. I am happy to vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of common knowledge of which Members of the House may well take judicial notice that since the Korean war prices of commodities and necessities of life have risen sharply and in marked degree.

American industry has taken account of this inflationary advance in prices. Wages and salaries have been generally raised in every section of industry. Farm income has been greatly enhanced by the Government support program. Everyone, or practically everyone in civilian industry, has received the benefit of wage and salary increases.

The Government has recognized this fact and we have heretofore established a Wage Stabilization Board which in policy and in practice has permitted wages and salaries to rise 10 percent and even more.

Only postal workers and Government workers have been held to the pre-Korean war wage level. Their living costs have risen, catapulted to new highs in some instances, and yet they have been unable to secure increased wage and salary benefits. Unquestionably and without a scintilla of doubt this situation has caused pinch and hardship in thousands of American families—the families of our faithful, efficient postal workers and other Government workers.

I do not believe that there is a thinking taxpayer in the country who would be willing to challenge the basic fairness of correcting these inequities.

In fact, I have not received one single communication protesting or opposing in any respect the equalizing of these salaries.

Let us do elementary justice to the postal workers and other Federal employees. Let us move at once to relieve them from the anxiety and hardship that attends their family living problems in this day of inflation. Let us vote for the fair, reasonable provisions of this legislation and other legislation intended to provide equitable and just treatment of our postal workers and Federal employees.

I will support this bill and the two other bills that will be presented to the House following the consideration of this measure. And I will oppose all crippling amendments which in effect would nullify the sound intentions and effects of these salutary measures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I want to state my opposition to this amendment for the reasons I have stated during general debate. I do not believe it is fair to make any cut in the provisions of this bill. Certainly we were very gen-

erous yesterday in regard to postal subsidies. I am sure we did not vote for those subsidies because of any letters from the general public. I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa said he knows the post-office employees are willing to suffer. How long does he want them to suffer, and to what extent does he want them to suffer?

There are 6,300 employees in the Detroit Post Office. Seventy-two percent of these employees are doing part-time work on a second job; 1,300 have been forced to quit their positions, of which number 500 held permanent positions, because of economic conditions. The Credit Union of the Post Office has made loans in Detroit of over \$1,000,000 in the first 8 months of this year.

I close my remarks by saying again, how much should they suffer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY) there were—ayes 18, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Page 10, following line 3, insert new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The President is authorized to investigate through the established agencies of the Government the facts relating to the cost of living in the United States during each 6-month period following the effective date of this act, and to establish the measure thereof in terms of the 'Consumer's Price Index for Moderate Income Families in Large Cities—All Items,' published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, on a monthly basis, which hereafter shall be referred to in this act as the basic Consumer's Price Index. The President is authorized and directed to establish an average basic Consumer's Price Index for each succeeding 6-month period following the date of the enactment of this act.

"(b) For each point or major fraction thereof by which the average basic Consumer's Price Index during any 6-month period after the enactment of this act varies from 185.4, the compensation of all officers and employees who received an increase in compensation under this act shall be increased or reduced during the following 6-month period at the rate of \$50 per annum for employees paid on an annual basis, 2½ cents per hour for hourly employees, and 2½ percent for postmasters at offices of the fourth class, in accordance with the increase or decrease in such average basic Consumer's Price Index."

And page 10, line 4, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert "SEC. 4."

And page 10, line 11, strike out "SEC. 4" and insert "SEC. 5."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this, of course, is the escalator clause, which has already been put into effect by the General Motors Corp., and by many other large corporations throughout the country. My reason for introducing it at this time is that I think it

is abundantly clear from the debate on the floor of the House today that in passing these pay-raise bills, we always come in too late with too little. This amendment would in no way affect the bill, that is, it would not affect the basic pay raise of \$400. That would remain permanent. But from there on out, we would be governed by the cost-of-living index. The President would refer to it every 6 months so that every 6 months, it could be equitably adjusted.

The figures given in the amendment are similar to the figures used by the General Motors contract, and others. There has been some question raised as to the difficulty of administration. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the great corporations of the country can administer such a clause, there is no reason why the United States Government should not be able to do likewise.

As to the sums to be appropriated, we have all heard of supplementary appropriations, and it might well be that it will be necessary to use those supplementary appropriations to fill out what is necessary at the end of the fiscal year. This has been done before. I know that it will be done again, and I cannot see that that would be any objection against the amendment.

The more I see of people living on fixed salaries under the present rising cost of living, the more I feel that the two things have got to be brought closer together. It is true that we are living in an inflationary period, but the only way to make that inflation bearable is to make the wage scale go up with the natural, or perhaps unnatural, fall of the dollar. If your dollar is worth only 50 cents, it stands to reason that you need two dollars where one would do before. It is true that injustice will still persist for those who are living on small, fixed incomes, for those who are living on retirement pay, but simply because some people suffer is no reason why we should not correct an injustice where it can be done equitably and easily.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. If you once put in your amendment, from here on these wages are frozen with the present bill as a basis. Do you not think that there should be more study given on an investigative and actuarial basis to see what this would mean on rise and fall as to the wages? Has there been enough time given to see what the history would have meant from 1939 to 1951, or what the history would mean if the cost of living goes up or goes down? Has enough time or attention been given to your amendment so that we can base all future rises and decreases on your amendment, or should we study it a little more and let the committee come back with a separate bill?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I believe that sufficient study has been given to it, but I will say to my colleague from Pennsylvania that it is of course perfectly true that most Members of the House have not had time to study this amendment. It is a new amendment. It is very new in thought, but on the other

hand, it has been used by business throughout the country. It has been approved of by labor throughout the country, and I have merely taken those figures and those opinions as the basis for the present amendment.

I hope that the House will give this amendment serious consideration. I feel sure that anyone who has listened to debate in the committee and who has listened to debate on the floor of this House must realize that we are working rather under a horse-and-buggy rule. We must modernize our thinking in these matters. We must also modernize and streamline our methods of taking care of these problems.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to compliment the gentlewoman on presenting this new idea, but I join with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] in asking whether the gentlewoman has consulted with the organization of postal employees and the various organizations affected. After all, they are the ones who would know whether this would be the proper approach.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I can only tell my colleague that I have consulted with individuals in various organizations. I have not consulted with the organizations as a whole. The individuals with whom I have talked have been favorably inclined toward this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Rather than use the word "opposing," I would use the phrase "a little hesitation." I happen to be one of those who has had considerable interest in the BLS index. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor spent several weeks interviewing all those people who had an interest in this index.

It is true, as the gentleman from New York stated, that there are today approximately 3,000,000 workers covered by contracts in accordance with that index; their increases are governed by the figures of the index.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why should not postal employees be under the escalator clause as well as anybody else?

Mr. WIER. I was coming to that, if the gentleman will let me proceed a little further.

These 3,000,000 workers who apparently have accepted the index as a guide for wage increases, or if conditions warrant it, adjustments downward, what unions and what organizations are they? They are certainly not Government employees. The unions that have agreed to and seem to be satisfied with the present arrangement are the United Auto Workers in the automobile industry, the United Rubber Workers in the rubber industry, the railroad workers in the railroad industry. All these workers, highly organized and industrialized, have been successful in estab-

lishing a good base rate because they have enjoyed the benefits of four, and in one or two cases five such pay increases. These are the unions that have established a good base pay to which the yardstick is to be applied.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I take it then that the gentleman's criticism is of the base pay, which the gentleman does not feel is adequate. I have already stated that I was in grave doubt that the base pay was adequate, but I do not feel that that is an argument against the amendment; it is an argument against the base pay. If the base pay is inadequate that should be changed first; then from there on have the escalator clause in effect just as it is in the case of wage contracts negotiated by these highly organized unions.

Mr. WIER. Then I will oppose the action on the basis that until the postal pay is brought up to the level of similar work in other industries, in private employment, that it not be applied to this present level of wages, because they are too low. I am sure I can agree with the gentlewoman that the standard of wages paid to Government employees, whether they be postal employees or employees of some other department or agency, are low.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I agree with the gentleman, but might I ask this question: If those wages and if that base pay were brought up to what he and I consider a more adequate level, would he then agree that an escalator clause would be a desirable thing to have in order to take care of these people rapidly and efficiently?

Mr. WIER. At least I would welcome the opportunity for a little review of it, and I think that would be the better place from which to start. Let us not apply a yardstick such as the BLS to a wage level or a wage base now that is exceptionally low, as has been admitted on the floor here time after time today. If the BLS index is to be applied to Government wage scales let us put them up to the basis of private employment and give them more nearly equal treatment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman I am sure will agree with me, however, that if this bill passes as it is going to and even with the retroactive clause, by next January we will again have to consider a raise in salaries, because it will be inadequate by next January.

Mr. WIER. Well, thank God, this is a great improvement over the present condition of these very loyal employees.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is much merit to the proposal contained in this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York. I do not, however, think it is wise to put it into this bill today. Far-reaching legislation of this kind should certainly be more carefully studied in committee. Such a study has not been made, and for that reason the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say a word in regard to the amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from New York. We tried in our school system when I was a school administrator, to operate under a cost-of-living index as a guide for salary increases of high-school teachers. We followed this practice for a time, and I think it was a very good solution for difficulties which we were encountering in our effort to raise the pay of school teachers to the point where they could keep up with the cost of living.

I am not certain that this proposal has received sufficient study to justify its incorporation in the bill before the House at this time, but I do believe that the gentlewoman from New York has offered a solution to the problems which arise in this Congress year after year.

I do not believe the situation is as complex as some of us seem to think. The Government has a way of calculating the value of the dollar, the purchasing power of the dollar. It uses as the base the years 1935-39. The Department of Commerce statistics show that today the purchasing power of the dollar is 44 cents. A year ago it was 57 cents. Just as long as the purchasing power of our dollar continues to decline we shall have to meet this problem year after year.

I am very much in favor of the bill that is before the House today—H. R. 244—and I am glad the retroactive clause has been left in it because I know that many postal workers have borrowed money and are anticipating meeting their obligations with the back pay which they will receive if this bill is passed with the retroactive provision.

The amendment which has been offered is one that deserves our very close study. I do not think it is too complex a problem to solve. It will meet a situation that will redound to the benefit of the postal workers, and I think in the end the Members of Congress will be glad they will not have to meet this pay situation year after year as we are bound to as long as this inflationary spiral lasts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] is a sensible amendment and it is workable. Unless you adopt the amendment suggested by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] you will be in here next year with another pay-raise bill. And, speaking about inflationary pressure, I hear on both sides of the aisle today the statement: "Oh, I am worried, I am concerned about the inflationary pressure and about the devaluation of the dollar."

I do not know just where it is going to stop and I do not think you do. We do know that since 1935-39 when the dollar was worth 100 cents that value has declined until the dollar today is worth only 44 cents. Under the present administration I dare say we will have a 20-cent dollar before they are through.

Many of you were in Germany, in Korea, in Japan and in Italy, and France, as I was, when the currency of those countries went to pieces. I have

in my office money of the value of \$50,000 and \$100,000 of those countries which could have bought a store when the currency was valuable. But today that money is worthless and you cannot even buy a loaf of bread with it.

What are you as Members of this Congress doing to try to keep the value of the dollar where it should be? I have often stated that it is the moral obligation of the Government, the banks, the trust companies and the insurance companies to keep the dollar value where it should be. It is not worth a dollar today and you know it. Here we are boosting salaries. This country is paying out today \$10,000,000,000 in salaries alone to Federal employees. Today the starting salary of a clerk in the Post Office Department is \$3,370 a year.

I do not know how a man with a family and children can live in Washington on \$3,370 a year. I admit that out in the country, in some of the smaller towns, where the cost of living is less, that they can get along probably very well with that, but you do not do it in the city, and there is no way to make that kind of a change.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The adoption of the St. George amendment will treat the postal employees equitably at all times, will it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seems to me that it would. If you stay on this slippery road of inflation and the person on a fixed salary is caught between two millstones, the upper millstone of inflation and the lower stone of taxes, then you crush all life out of him. This is the situation that this administration has kept us in for the last 20 years. Its spend and spend, tax and tax, and add to that elect and elect. I say to you that an economic crash in this country is pending and this can destroy you just as quickly and as thoroughly as a military defeat. Some place along the line Congress should have common sense enough to put a halt to this inflationary spiral. The Congress, in fact, is delegated by the Constitution to control the money situation, but we have let it slip out of our hands, and we are facing today in this country an economic crisis which you better be worried about.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Has not a similar plan been put into effect by some of the larger industries and corporations of the country, and if they can make it operate, why can we not make it operate?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is a sensible approach. I do not know whether the basic scale is right or not, but I say to you, if this spending goes on such as we have now had for years and years, you will be in here next year asking for another increase. I see Members here today worrying about what is happening. Well, some of you voted for all this New Deal spending time and time again. The Government printing presses and spending by Gov-

ernment creates cheap money. In my opinion there is a flight from the dollar today—I fear unless the brakes are put on our savings are lost. A sound dollar is needed. A cost-of-living-index formula is a sound approach.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am amused today, especially at this particular moment. Certainly the people, the postal employees, as well as all other employees and all the consumers need a break. Charles Wilson pleaded with us to put in a program of controls, and the ones who licked us on controls came from that side. So, I do not know why we need all these crocodile tears here today.

Mr. Chairman, inflation must be avoided. I happened to be in Europe in 1926 and I happened to see what the tourists did with the French money. They pasted it on their luggage and the newspapers editorialized the fact. As a tourist, I was chagrined and I said at that time, "Let that never happen in America in my presence, at least." I went into some of the stores in Paris when the sales girls had to call up every few minutes to find out what the rate of exchange was.

There is a basic thing to do for our living expenses today, and that is to put on controls in order to have equality of sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, something must be done about rising prices. Just last Saturday night I went to the butcher shop to buy some lamb chops. I thought I would finally get off a self-imposed meat strike and buy some lamb chops. I asked for the loin lamb chops, a favorite cut with my daughter and me. I asked what they were a pound. Imagine what the butcher said, "\$1.57 a pound." You know how many lamb chops that would be: Four mouthfuls of loin; that would be about four chops. So I said, "Well, I think I shall take a little veal; that will not be so expensive." But, I did not have sense enough to ask how much veal was; I did not think it would ever be anything like \$1.57 a pound; so I had a little loin of veal cut off, about a quarter-inch thick. Really, I was tempted to bring it here to show you Members, or your wives who buy the groceries. Unfortunately, I have to cook, too, besides being a Member of Congress. The butcher wrote \$1.64 on the package, drew a line under it, and then wrote a "1." I really thought the "\$1" meant the price—\$1. When I went to pay for it—I always watch the cash register—it was \$1.64, and I think the whole store heard me gasp.

Just the other day I moved to a new apartment, and I locked my trunk keys in a trunk. I called a locksmith, whose place of business is a block and a half away from my apartment, to come unlock the trunk. He did. It took him about 3 minutes, and the bill was \$4.50.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. In just a moment. I want these people to know what some of the current prices are today.

Just yesterday I made arrangements to park my car outside and to pay \$10 a month. I called last night before I left

my office, and the price had risen very suddenly to \$15.

I do not know where we are going except we cannot put up with the rise in the cost of living. I am sure all the consuming wage-earning, salary-earning public agree with me.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sorry to interrupt the gentlewoman. I am also sorry to think how much time she has had to spend shopping around. That is something we have all had to do.

Mrs. BOSONE. At least we know how to live when we do those things.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. We know how we do live anyway. Someone has just pointed out to me that our pay checks are all the same, so that when we come down to that we know pretty well what it costs to live.

Mrs. BOSONE. Does the gentlewoman happen to know how much she pays for the meat she eats?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I certainly do know it. I filled out a questionnaire for the New York Times telling them how I live, and if it would interest the gentlewoman even more, I wish someday she could have a little talk with my banker and see my bank account.

Mrs. BOSONE. I would gladly trade mine for hers.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would gladly trade with the gentlewoman. What I do want to bring out, and I know that the gentlewoman knows it because she is an extremely well-informed Member of Congress, is that the President has the powers for control, and very great powers. The powers he now possesses are far greater than any possessed by President Roosevelt during the last war. So I think the matter of control could be taken care of if there were a will to do it.

Mrs. BOSONE. I think it could be taken care of, too, if the will were on your side of the aisle. It is a matter of record that you people plus a few of our own licked us on controls. Let us have this equality of sacrifice more than an ideal for everybody.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, does this close debate on the entire bill in 20 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. This will close all debate on the committee amendment, and all amendments thereto.

The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Does any Member who was on his feet at the time debate was limited desire to be heard on the pending amendment? If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ST. GEORGE) there were—ayes 69, noes 88.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. ST. GEORGE and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 90, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THORNBERRY: Page 10, after line 3, insert the following:

"(c) Subsection (e) of section 17 of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In addition to the salaries provided in this section, each carrier in the rural-delivery service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to (1) 9 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled or (2) \$3 per day, whichever is the greater. Payments for equipment and maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane because it makes no reference to salaries of postal employees or reassignment of grades. This is for maintenance of equipment of rural carriers, which is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THORNBERRY. If I may, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment was prepared with the assistance of the Legislative Counsel's Office. Since my amendment is to Public Law 134 and since H. R. 244 also provides amendments to Public Law 134 it was thought that this amendment would be germane. May I also call your attention to the fact that in Public Law 134 additional mileage to rural carriers for the use of their automobiles was provided and that Public Law 134 itself provided additional compensation to postal employees just as H. R. 244 does.

And may I point out that the bill which the Senate passed, providing pay raises for postal employees, contains this very provision which my amendment would add to the bill. My amendment seeks to provide additional compensation to rural carriers and for that reason it seems to me is a proper amendment.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the point of order raised by the gentleman from Tennessee is based on the ground of germaneness to the bill before us. The long parliamentary practice has been for the Chair to hold that any matter brought up under a bill that came within the scope of the bill or petition was germane. As I understand the point of order raised by the gentleman from Tennessee it was that the amendment was not germane.

Permit me to state that this is a bill to take care of the salaries of postal em-

ployees, and this amendment relates to a part of the salary of the rural carriers; in other words, if a rural-free-delivery carrier got \$5,000 a year, which he does not, part of the compensation is computed on a mileage basis. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas relates to an allowance which is part of their salary. I think therefore it is very much germane. The purpose of the bill is to increase salaries and this amendment relates to a part of the weekly or monthly income of the rural carrier.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I wish to point out that the history of this equipment allowance is that when increases have been made it has been in a similar manner that the House is now acting. Public Law 134 which was a pay bill, included equipment allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the purpose of this bill is to reduce the number of grades for the various positions in the postal service and to grant salary increases to the personnel.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes that the rural delivery carrier shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to such and such. The amendment, therefore, is not within the scope of the bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have an amendment to offer?

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The original amendment has been ruled out; to be consistent the Chair must make the same ruling in the case of the gentleman's amendment, if offered.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the Chair mean by the Chair's ruling that in order for this particular matter to be considered it would have to be entirely as new legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair simply made the ruling on the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Texas in relation to the bill now being discussed by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the Chair this: Suppose we should go to conference with the other body, would they be permitted to consider it in the conference committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to point out to the gentleman from Missouri that the Chair is not in a position to rule on that question. That would be determined by the Speaker at the proper time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes; he was on his feet at the time the motion limiting debate was made.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I was inclined to the opinion that the point of order made against the last amendment in reference to rural mail carriers was not a good one.

Mr. Chairman, very seldom do I get up on the floor of the House and make unnecessary remarks; that is, remarks which in my opinion are unnecessary; although I am not going to quarrel with anyone else who may do that.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that was just offered sought to take care of rural carriers. Everyone in this House or anywhere else in the United States knows that the price of automobiles has increased from \$850 to \$2,000 or more, also that the price of gasoline and the price of oil have gone up accordingly. The men who bring the mail to us living in the rural areas have to pay these increases.

You state here that you are going to raise his salary by this bill. You are not raising his salary at all. You are making it harder and harder for him to go out and deliver mail in the rural districts.

Mr. Chairman, who is the backbone of this country? Is it the lawyer from Tennessee or a lawyer from New York? Or is it someone who raises a family in the rural communities and sends them to church on Sunday?

Mr. Chairman, I want to take care of the postal employees because they are not getting enough money, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANFUSO:

Page 10, after line 10, insert the following:

"Sec. 4. (a) So much of section 6 of the act entitled 'An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes', approved July 6, 1945, as amended, as precedes the second paragraph thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

"Sec. 6. Postmasters, officers, and employees shall be granted 26 days' leave of absence with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year and sick leave with pay at the rate of 15 days a year, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative. Sick leave shall be granted only upon satisfactory evidence of illness in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That the 26 days' leave shall be credited at the rate of 2 1/8 days for each month of actual service: *Provided further*, That classified substitute employees, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be granted the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave that accrue to regular employees in proportion to the time on the roll."

"(b) Section 601 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, is hereby repealed.

XCVII—741

"(c) Subsection (b) hereof shall take effect as of the date of enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952."

And on page 10, line 11, strike out "Sec. 4" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 5."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not germane to the pending bill. It does not pertain to any provision of the bill now under consideration which relates only to salary and to reassignment of the first three grades of Public Law 134.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANFUSO. No; Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

As the Chair stated before, this bill provides for the number of grades and positions in the postal field service and also provides salary increases for personnel in such service.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York deals neither with the number of grades or positions in the postal service nor with salary increases as such. It concerns an entirely different matter, namely, annual and sick leave.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JARMAN: On page 9, line 24, before the period insert a colon and the following: "And provided further, That the rate of compensation of such employees shall not be increased to an amount greater than \$7,500 per annum because of the increased compensation provided in this subsection."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment of which I spoke when we were in general debate on the bill. Very briefly, because time does not give me an opportunity to go into detail, the thought of it is this: In repetition let me say again I think that now, if there ever was such a time, we must effect every domestic economy possible. I feel I would have great difficulty going back to my State and my district and explaining to the people that I represent why I felt it necessary to increase by 1 cent the salary of any man or woman making as much as \$7,500 a year, \$8,000, \$9,000, \$10,000, \$11,000 or \$13,000 a year. I have offered this amendment to cut off at \$7,500 any addition in salary for any employee in the Post Office Department. I point out to you in that connection, though, that in terms of the big money in which we so often speak in this House, the saving will be only \$120,000 on this bill, and only 300 employees in the postal department are affected. If this committee and this House votes to add this amendment to the bill, I will naturally introduce a similar amendment to the Federal classified employees' bill which will next be before us. Now that amendment will affect some 23,000 employees, and achieve a saving of nearly \$10,000,000. Vote the present cut-off

amendment in terms of both bills and all Federal employees. I hope you will support this amendment as a domestic economy that we should achieve.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest reluctance that I oppose this amendment offered by my very dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], a member of the committee. As I understand the amendment, it applies to postmasters receiving \$7,500 or more. I also understand that he will offer a similar amendment when the next bill, H. R. 4255, comes up. I need only offer one example in opposition to this bill which generally applies in our big cities. I will relate the situation concerning my own postmaster in Brooklyn, the Honorable Edward Quigley, who has an enviable record. He runs one of the largest post offices in the entire United States. He gets a salary which is just a little above \$7,500 but he operates over 110 substations and heads over 7,000 employees. This is a gigantic job. If he were employed in private industry, he would get at least \$25,000, and I told him so. Let us be fair to everybody today. We have already raised the salaries of those in the lower brackets. It would be extremely unfair to say that the managers, those who really run our postal department, are not entitled to a raise. The cost of living for them, too, has gone up. I therefore think that in principle and in equity we ought to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] would be held germane, because his was a good amendment; in fact, many of the Members have similar amendments in mind and some of us have prepared bills to that effect.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. When this legislation goes to conference between the House and the Senate that matter can be worked out. The Senate bill has a provision along the lines of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman.

On October 10, 1949, I introduced the bill H. R. 6362 which provided 9 cents per mile for the rural carriers or at least \$3.50 per day, plus 2 cents additional for each mile for those who travel on dirt roads. This would compensate those rural carriers who incur additional wear and tear on their equipment due to dirt roads.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill, however, I think this amendment would have added greatly to the benefits of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my own remarks I wish to read to the Members the

following letter from the rural carriers in Oklahoma:

ARNETT, OKLA., September 25, 1949.
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: In our Ellis-Lipscomb County Rural Carrier's meeting here tonight, in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Frosty D. Lewright, legislation relative to rural carriers and postal workers was discussed quite extensively.

We rural carriers out in the short-grass country, where all-weather roads are wished for but not to be had, are very much in favor of the 9-cent-per-mile equipment allowance. Under present conditions we find the 7 cents per mile we are now drawing inadequate to cover our actual expense. We want you to know that we deeply appreciate your efforts in our behalf to bring to pass these bills before Congress at this time to put the rural carrier and other postal workers on more of an equal basis with other Government employees.

We have been informed by our postmasters of the letter you sent them informing them of your stand in their and our behalf and we wish at this time to individually express our gratitude for your untiring efforts.

Please accept this informal note as our humble thanks for everything.

Sincere best wishes to you and yours, we are

Yours very truly,
Lewright, Arnett, Okla.; Robert L. Denney, Edgar C. Johns, Cecil J. Nash, Harvey P. Overshiner, Shattuck, Okla.; Chester L. Miller, Fargo, Okla.; D. B. McName, Higgins, Tex.; J. G. Shultz, Follett, Tex.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I secured this time at the moment when we were discussing the question of inflation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] made one of the wisest statements the other day that I have ever heard when he said that this attempt to fix prices without attempting to regulate the volume of the currency was like fixing the price of a bushel of wheat or corn and letting the other fellow fix the size of the bushel.

The trouble is that Congress has not done anything on earth, the Committee on Banking and Currency has not turned its hand, to check the inflation of the currency that is going on through the Federal Reserve System.

In October 1928 we had \$4,800,000,000 in circulation. I had helped to investigate the Cotton Exchange. When we took the hands of the manipulators off it, cotton went back up to its normal value of 22 cents a pound.

Today we have almost four times that amount of money in circulation, or \$27,-278,000,000, of which \$22,966,000,000 is Federal Reserve notes, and the Federal Reserve banks are continuing to expand. Yet we are talking about fixing the price of the farmer's products, and doing nothing to check the inflation of the currency.

This fellow DiSalle, who comes from the East Side of New York by way of Ohio has fixed the price of cotton. To-

day I called and found out what the price was in Brazil and what it was in the United States. It is about \$85 a bale higher in Brazil than it is in the United States. That will likely cost the farmers of Mississippi something like \$170,000,000 on their cotton this year.

Here you talk about fixing the price of the farmer's commodity, but you permit these Federal Reserve bankers to continue to expand our currency and drag the country down the inflation road to where we are likely to come to wreck and ruin, unless something is done to stop it.

I appeal to the Committee on Banking and Currency to take up this proposition of regulating the expansion of the currency and check the inflation of the currency before it wrecks the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is the opinion of all the Members of the House and the members of the postal employees' groups that we are glad that this long effort in debate and hearings is about to conclude and that very soon, we hope, our employees will be enjoying the benefits of this long, overdue pay raise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], who has not heretofore had a chance to speak on this matter.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States have been proud of our postal service. The employees of the postal service have set a standard of loyalty and fidelity which has been a fine model for all Government employees. The old slogan "The mail must go through," has thrilled us all. The postal employee has been more than just a servant of the Government. He has for years been a respected member and leader in the civic life of the community. The esteem accorded this position attracted men and women of the highest caliber. It seems as though we have forgotten that that postal worker is an individual and must have shelter and food the same as the rest of us. In many ways his plight has been unnoticed because he cannot strike; he is not entitled to collective bargaining; and he must depend entirely upon Congress for his pay.

Through no fault of the postal worker we do have inflation. Our involvement in the Korean conflict and our rearmament efforts are forcing the cost of living higher and higher. This postal worker now cannot live on his meager pay. Many are quitting, others are forced to take part-time employment to supplement their incomes, and others are borrowing from their friends to support their families. It seems as though we can hear the clamor for money and help from all corners of the earth above the pleas of those who are closest to us. The

situation is clear. If we are to have an efficient postal service we must see that the postal workers get a living wage. It certainly is not good government or wise economy to back global plans for advancement and ignore the well-being of our own country and our own people.

This bill must pass and amendments aimed at crippling it must be defeated. To approve this pay increase is only the merest gratitude we can extend to these public servants whose service has been of the greatest value in uniting our people and strengthening our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved time to speak on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] against which a point of order was raised. However, I am very happy to hear the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service say that this matter will be adequately taken care of when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, more than 9 months ago I made up my mind that there is a definite need for a pay increase for Federal workers. Since then, the prices of food, clothing, and the other necessities of life have continued to skyrocket. These costs are high not only in Washington but throughout the United States. Our postal workers, serving on limited salaries, have found it increasingly difficult to meet these soaring costs.

All during this time I have agitated for a pay increase, for these workers, knowing of their needs and problems. Now I am glad that the bill has reached the floor and am anxious to see it become law. This bill ought to have the unanimous approval of this Congress. Considering the inflated cost of living, the proposed increase is certainly moderate and we should not grumble about allowing postal and Federal employees to have a reasonable standard of living based on the American needs.

Probably no class of employees anywhere presents a higher standard of Americanism and patriotism than postal and Federal employees. We are very exacting of postal employees and through the Federal Bureau of Investigation make a careful inquiry into their backgrounds to make sure that they are not tainted with "isms" or alien doctrines. We require that they be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

In Louisiana the Government employees generally do a fine job in their work for the Government and the Congress in turn should deal equitably with them.

Democracy requires that we treat all groups of our society with justice and equity and this certainly includes those called upon to carry on the necessary work of government.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Resolution 244, which has for its purpose the granting of a \$400 increase in pay per year to every person working in the United States postal service, except fourth-class postmasters who are given a raise of 20 percent on the compensation they now receive, and except those employees of

the postal service who are now paid on an hourly rate, and this bill provides an increase of 20 cents per hour for them.

The increases granted by this bill are permanent, and are subject to retirement deductions.

As I have said many times before the employees of the postal service come in closer contact with the people of this country than do employees of any other department or agency of the Government. Their salaries are now, and have in the past, been low. I personally feel that they should be paid salaries and compensation that are more in line with those paid by private industry for similar services.

Government employees, because they are Government employees, are not allowed to bargain for increases in compensation and other benefits as are employees of private industry. They are not allowed to strike. There is no economic pressure that they can bring to bear. They are dependent on the Congress of the United States for fair treatment. It is only here that their wages can be increased.

And, I, for one, am glad to participate in granting them this increase in pay which they so justly deserve. The pinch of rising prices has been felt by these employees all along the line because they are poorly paid to begin with. And the same thing is true of all Federal employees in the lower grades.

These employees are Americans. They are taxpayers. Their tax load is already heavy, and unfortunately it must grow heavier.

I believe that the American people who know the facts are quite willing for our postal employees, and our other employees to have a raise in salary and compensation at this time. I do not recall having received a single letter or communication of any kind opposing this legislation.

On yesterday we passed a bill increasing postal rates. Shortly there will be an increase in parcel post rates. These raises, so far as the postal employees are concerned, will more than offset the raise in their pay that will be granted by this bill. I believe that the American people, in the interest of a more efficient postal system, are willing to pay higher rates of postage on those items, such as fourth-class mail, and second-class mail that are not now paying their way.

This raise in pay for postal people will be retroactive to July 1 of this year,

and I think this is fair. July 1 is the beginning of the Government's fiscal year. The matter of this raise has been before the Congress now since last January.

The Post Office Department has been losing large sums of money in recent years. The reason for that cannot be blamed on the Post Office Department itself. A recent survey of various departments of the Government found that in the Post Office Department there was no overstaffing of employees. The reason for the postal deficit is that postal rates have not kept up with advancing costs in every line of endeavor. I have never felt that the Post Office Department should be required to balance income with outgo, because the Post Office Department is a service department. Its services go to the American people. However, I have felt all along that its income should come much closer to balancing with its expenditures than it now does. During the Eighty-first Congress I worked and voted for an increase in postal rates, and the bill finally passed the House, but never became law. On yesterday I voted for the rate increase, but I am not at all sure that it is large enough to accomplish the desired purpose. Postal rates may have to be raised again before very long.

The American people demand good postal services. I believe that they are willing to pay in very large degree for those good services.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to say that I favor, and will vote for the postmaster's salary reclassification bill, which will be up today. The postmaster is in charge of the postoffice which he serves. He is responsible for its management and efficiency. He should be paid a salary that is in keeping with his duty and responsibility.

The congressional district which I have the honor to represent has 100 post offices. It is a rural district. Most of these post offices are small. Rural routes go out from these post offices to serve the rural patrons. I am most anxious that the rural people of the district which I serve have the best possible mail service available. I am confident that the two bills which I have spoken of will increase the efficiency of that service all along the line. I am glad to discharge my duty as I see it by voting for these bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee [Mr. MURRAY], to close debate.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McKINNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 244) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 419, he reported the bill back with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and asked for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), is amended by inserting after section 11 thereof a new section as follows:

"GRADES AND SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES IN THE AUTOMATIC GRADES

"SEC. 11A. (a) Employees shall be divided into grades and shall receive basic annual salaries or hourly rates of pay as shown in the following compensation schedules:

Regular employees	Grades								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Clerks in post offices of the third class; carriers in village delivery service.....	\$2,579	\$2,687	\$2,796	\$2,905					
Laborers; cleaners; matrons, head charmen and head charwomen; junior mechanics.....	2,687	2,796	2,905	3,014	\$3,123				
Firemen laborers; elevator operators.....	2,796	2,905	3,014	3,123	3,231				
Mail handlers; messengers; watchmen; operators of the pneumatic tube service; garagemen drivers; skilled laborers; sewers.....	3,014	3,123	3,231	3,340					
Telephone operators; firemen; guards; window cleaners; skilled helpers.....	3,014	3,123	3,231	3,340	3,449				
Special delivery messengers.....	3,014	3,123	3,231	3,340	3,449	\$3,558	\$3,667		
Elevator starters.....	3,123	3,231	3,340	3,449	3,558				
Clerks; carriers in the city delivery service; dispatchers of the pneumatic tube service; driver mechanics and general mechanics in motor vehicle service; nurses.....	3,123	3,231	3,340	3,449	3,558	3,667	3,775	\$3,884	\$3,993
Assistant enginemen; general mechanics (custodial); elevator mechanic helpers; pressmen, lockmakers, mail bag repairers, mail bag examiners, postmarking stamp makers, and mechanics in mail equipment shops; requisition fillers and packers in Division of Equipment and Supplies.....	3,340	3,449	3,558	3,667	3,775				

Regular employees	Grades								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Postal transportation clerks on class A runs, in terminals, air-mail fields and offices of division superintendents and district superintendents; operators of highway post-office vehicles...	\$3,340	\$3,449	\$3,558	\$3,667	\$3,775	\$3,884	\$3,993		
Postal transportation clerks on class B runs; transfer clerks in transfer offices and in air mail fields; clerks in inspection service...	3,340	3,449	3,558	3,667	3,775	3,884	3,993	\$4,102	\$4,211
Mechanics; painters...	3,558	3,667	3,775	3,884	3,993	4,102	4,211		
Elevator mechanics...	3,775	3,884	3,993	4,102	4,211				
Special mechanics...	4,211	4,319							
Principal review clerks...	4,211	4,319	4,428	4,538					
Traveling mechanics...	4,537	4,646	4,755	4,863	4,972	5,081	5,190		
Cost accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen in mail equipment shops...	4,755	4,863							
Examiners of equipment and supplies...	5,081	5,190	5,299	5,409	5,516	5,625	5,734	5,843	
Carriers in rural delivery service:									
Fixed compensation per annum...	1,289	1,320	1,352	1,383	1,414	1,446	1,477	1,509	1,540
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route...	58	60	62	64	66	68	70	73	74
For each mile of route over 30 miles...	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
SUBSTITUTE, TEMPORARY, AUXILIARY, AND CHAR EMPLOYEES									
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:									
Fixed compensation per annum...	1,289								
Compensation per mile per annum:									
For each mile up to 30 miles of route...	58								
For each mile of route over 30 miles...	20								
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carrier absent without pay...	(1)								
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent with pay...									
Hourly rates									
Clerks in post offices of the third class; carriers in village delivery service...	1.26	1.33	1.38	1.43					
Charwomen and charwomen...	1.34	1.39							
Mail handlers, messengers, watchmen; operators of the pneumatic tube service; garagemen, drivers...	1.49	1.54	1.59	1.65					
Special delivery messengers...	1.49	1.54	1.59	1.65	1.70	1.76	1.81		
Clerks; carriers in city delivery service; driver mechanics; general mechanics; dispatchers of the pneumatic tube service...	1.54	1.59	1.65	1.70	1.76	1.81	1.87	1.92	1.97
Postal transportation clerks...	1.65	1.70	1.76	1.81	1.87	1.92	1.97		
Special mechanics...	1.88								

¹ Rate authorized for the regular carrier.

"(b) Employees for whom annual salaries are provided by subsection (a), charwomen, substitute railway postal clerks, and substitute mail handlers in the Railway Mail Service shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the top automatic grade."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 11 (b) of such act of July 6, 1945, is amended by striking out "grade 9" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "grade 7."

(b) Section 12 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Marine carriers assigned to the Detroit River marine service shall be paid an annual salary of \$300 in excess of the highest salary provided for carriers in the automatic grades in the city delivery service: *Provided*, That the annual salary of such marine carriers shall not be in excess of \$4,293."

(c) Section 12 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Clerks in post offices of the third class shall not be appointed or promoted to a salary grade in excess of \$100 less than the salary of the postmaster at the office to which assigned. Substitute, temporary, or auxiliary clerks in post offices of the third class shall not be paid in excess of \$1.38 per hour where the salary of the postmaster is \$3,019 per annum; and in excess of \$1.33 per hour where the salary of the postmaster is \$2,883 per annum."

(d) Section 15 (f) of such act is amended by striking out "\$3,270" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,558."

(e) Section 16 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences, including the proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Clerks assigned to class A lines shall be promoted successively to grade 7, and clerks assigned to class B lines shall be promoted successively to grade 9."

(f) Section 16 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and air mail field railway post offices shall be promoted successively to grade 7. In terminal railway post offices and air mail field railway post offices having twenty or more employees, there shall be appointed for each general foreman, foreman, and clerk in charge a clerk whose basic annual salary shall be \$100 per annum less than the lowest grade foreman or clerk in charge in each organization and such clerks shall act as general foreman, foreman, or clerk in charge during the absences of the employee for whom designated."

(g) Section 16 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Clerks assigned to transfer offices shall be promoted successively to grade 9. In transfer offices having twenty or more employees, there shall be appointed for each general foreman, foreman, and clerk in charge a clerk whose basic annual salary shall be \$100 per annum less than the lowest grade foreman or clerk in charge in each organization and such clerks shall act as general foreman, foreman, or clerk in charge during the absences of the employee for whom designated."

(h) Section 16 (g) of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out "grade 9" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "grade 7";

(2) by striking out "grade 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade 9"; and

(3) by striking out so much of the second sentence as precedes the first proviso.

(i) Section 16 (h) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) Examiners to be eligible to receive the salary provided in this act shall first progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 7."

(j) Section 16 (j) of such act is amended by striking out "grade 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade 7."

(k) Section 16 (k) of such act is amended by striking out all after "regular employees assigned to road duty" and inserting in lieu thereof "on an hourly basis at the rates prescribed in section 11A."

(l) Section 16 (o) of such act is amended by striking out all preceding the proviso therein.

(m) Section 17 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Carriers in Rural Delivery Service shall be divided into grades, with salaries based in part on specified rates per mile per annum and in part on fixed compensation per annum, as provided in section 11T."

(n) Section 17 (d) is amended by striking out "\$3,970" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,293."

(o) The following portions of such act are repealed: Section 12 (b), section 12 (c), section 12 (d), section 13 (b), section 13 (c), section 13 (d), section 14 (b), section 14 (c), section 14 (d), section 14 (e), section 14 (f), section 14 (g), section 14 (h), section 14 (i), section 14 (j), section 14 (k), section 15 (d), section 15 (e), section 16 (b), section 16 (n), section 16 (s), section 18 (b), section 18 (c), section 18 (d), section 18 (e), section 19 (a), section 19 (c), section 19 (d), section 22 (a), and section 22 (b).

SEC. 3. Sections 2 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service," approved October 28, 1949, are repealed.

SEC. 4 (a) Each employee on the rolls at the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this Act for whom automatic grades and salaries are provided by section 11A of such Act of July 6, 1945, as added by this Act, who—

(1) entered the field service after June 30, 1945, and

(2) (A) has not been advanced at least two automatic grades through the operation of the provisions of the first section and section 2 of the act of March 6, 1946, as

amended (Public Law 317, 79th Cong.), the act of July 31, 1946, as amended (Public Law 577, 79th Cong.), and section 2 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the act of October 28, 1949; (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.), or (B) is not advanced at least two automatic grades through the operation of such provisions and the operation of the provisions of section 14 (b) (1) of this act—

shall be advanced two automatic grades or, if such employee has been advanced one automatic grade through the operation of such provisions, shall be advanced one automatic grade. For the purposes of this section, the assignment of any employee in grade 1 or 2 on the effective date of this act to grade 1 as provided in section 14 (b) (1) shall be considered as an advancement of two or one automatic grades, respectively.

(b) Each special delivery messenger on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office

Department on the effective date of this act who, on July 1, 1945, had been continuously employed as a special delivery messenger for more than 1 year but less than 2 years shall be advanced one automatic grade.

(c) Any advancement under subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be effective as of the effective date of this act and shall not be considered as a promotion for purposes of determining the date on which any employee is eligible for a promotion to the next higher grade.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 8 (a) of such act of July 6, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The salaries of postmasters and assistant postmasters at all classes of post offices and of officers and supervisory employees at post offices of the first class shall be annual salaries, to be fixed by the Postmaster General based upon gross postal re-

ceipts as shown in the quarterly returns of the respective post offices for the calendar year immediately preceding, at the following rates: *Provided*, That subsection (c) of section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 285), as amended, is hereby repealed retroactive to January 1, 1944, and thereafter the gross postal receipts shall be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or other employees, whose compensation or allowances are based on the annual receipts of such offices: *Provided further*, That in fixing the salaries of the postmaster and supervisory employees in the post office at Washington, District of Columbia, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, add not to exceed 75 percent to the gross receipts of that office:

Post offices of the first class

Gross receipts	Per annum rates					
	Postmaster	Assistant postmaster	General superintendent of mails; general superintendent of finance	Assistant general superintendent of mails	Assistant general superintendent of finance	Superintendents
\$80,000,000 and up.....	\$13,770	\$8,470	\$7,470	\$6,870	\$6,870	\$6,470
\$40,000,000 to \$80,000,000.....	13,770	8,470	7,470	6,870	6,870	6,470
\$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000.....	12,770	7,970	7,270	6,870	6,870	6,470
\$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000.....	11,770	7,070	6,870	6,670	6,670	6,270
\$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000.....	10,770	6,870	6,570	6,470	6,470	6,170

Gross receipts	Per annum rates								
	Senior assistant superintendents	Chief station examiner	Assistant superintendents	Auditor	Assistant auditor	Station examiners	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
\$80,000,000 and up.....	\$6,270	\$5,470	\$5,670	\$6,170	\$5,470	\$5,170	\$5,370	\$4,896	\$4,570
\$40,000,000 to \$80,000,000.....	6,270	5,470	5,670	6,170	5,470	5,170	5,331	4,896	4,570
\$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000.....	6,202	5,470	5,670	5,984	5,470	5,170	5,331	4,896	4,570
\$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000.....	5,870	5,370	5,658	4,970	4,870	4,970	5,114	4,896	4,570
\$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000.....	5,766	5,370	5,270	4,870	4,770	4,970	5,005	4,896	4,570

Gross receipts	Per annum rates						
	Postmaster	Assistant postmaster	Superintendent of mails	Superintendent of finance	Superintendent of money orders	Senior assistant superintendent of mails	Assistant superintendents of mails
\$3,000,000 to \$7,000,000	\$9, 770	\$6, 270	\$6, 070	\$5, 770	\$5, 470	\$5, 670	\$5, 270
\$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000	8, 770	6, 070	5, 870	5, 470	5, 170	5, 470	5, 270
\$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000	7, 770	6, 070	5, 870	5, 470	5, 170		5, 270
\$600,000 to \$1,000,000	7, 370	5, 970	5, 670	5, 270	5, 070		5, 070
\$500,000 to \$600,000	7, 070	5, 870	5, 470	5, 170	4, 970		5, 070
\$400,000 to \$500,000	6, 570	5, 770	5, 370				5, 005
\$300,000 to \$400,000	6, 370	5, 670	5, 370				5, 005
\$250,000 to \$300,000	6, 170	5, 570	5, 270				5, 005
\$200,000 to \$250,000	6, 070	5, 470	5, 170				
\$150,000 to \$200,000	5, 970	5, 370	5, 170				
\$120,000 to \$150,000	5, 870	5, 270	5, 070				
\$90,000 to \$120,000	5, 770	5, 170	5, 005				
\$75,000 to \$90,000	5, 670	5, 070	4, 896				
\$60,000 to \$75,000	5, 570	4, 970	4, 787				
\$50,000 to \$60,000	5, 470	4, 970	4, 678				
\$40,000 to \$50,000	5, 370	4, 896	4, 570				

Gross receipts	Per annum rates						
	Assistant superintendents of finance	Assistant superintendents of money orders	Auditor	Station examiners	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
\$3,000,000 to \$7,000,000.....	\$5,270	\$4,970	\$4,870	\$4,970	\$5,005	\$4,787	\$4,570
\$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$600,000 to \$1,000,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$500,000 to \$600,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$400,000 to \$500,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$300,000 to \$400,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$250,000 to \$300,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$200,000 to \$250,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$150,000 to \$200,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$120,000 to \$150,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
\$90,000 to \$120,000.....	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570

Number of employees supervised	Superintendent of shops	Assistant superintendent of shops	General foremen of mechanics	Foremen of mechanics	General foremen of laborers	Foremen of laborers	Foremen of elevator operators	Captain of guard	Lieutenant of guard	Chief telephone operator	Assistant chief telephone operator
151 and up.....	\$6, 770	\$5, 970	-----	-----	\$4, 770	-----	\$4, 470	\$4, 570	-----	-----	-----
101 to 150.....	6, 770	5, 970	-----	-----	4, 570	-----	4, 470	4, 570	-----	-----	-----
61 to 100.....	6, 570	5, 875	-----	-----	4, 352	\$4, 134	4, 352	4, 570	-----	-----	-----
41 to 60.....	6, 370	5, 658	\$5, 222	-----	4, 134	4, 134	4, 352	4, 570	-----	-----	-----
31 to 40.....	-----	-----	5, 222	\$4, 787	4, 134	4, 134	4, 352	4, 352	\$4, 134	\$4, 270	\$3, 917
21 to 30.....	-----	-----	5, 222	4, 787	-----	3, 917	-----	4, 352	4, 134	4, 270	3, 917
11 to 20.....	-----	-----	5, 222	4, 787	-----	3, 917	-----	4, 134	4, 134	4, 270	3, 917
1 to 10.....	-----	-----	5, 222	4, 787	-----	3, 699	-----	3, 917	3, 917	4, 270	3, 917

	Foremen	Clerks in charge
151 and up.....	-----	-----
101 to 150.....	-----	-----
61 to 100.....	\$4, 787	\$4, 570
41 to 60.....	4, 787	4, 570
31 to 40.....	4, 787	4, 570
21 to 30.....	4, 787	4, 570
11 to 20.....	4, 787	4, 570
1 to 10.....	4, 787	4, 570

SEC. 10. (a) Section 15 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The annual salaries of inspectors in charge, assistant inspectors in charge, and supervisory employees at division headquarters of the Inspection Service shall be as follows:

"Title	Per annum rates
Post office inspector in charge.....	\$8, 470
Assistant post office inspector in charge.....	7, 770
Superintendent.....	5, 770

"Title	Per annum rates
Assistant superintendent.....	\$5, 270
Chiefs of section.....	5, 170"

(b) That portion of section 15 (b) of such act which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Post office inspectors shall be divided into 10 grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1.....	\$4, 970
Grade 2.....	5, 170
Grade 3.....	5, 370
Grade 4.....	5, 570
Grade 5.....	5, 770

Grade 6.....	5, 970
Grade 7.....	6, 370
Grade 8.....	6, 770
Grade 9.....	7, 270
Grade 10.....	7, 770

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 8:"

SEC. 11. Section 16 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The annual salaries of officers and supervisory employees in the postal transportation service shall be as follows:

Organizations	General superintendent	Assistant general superintendent	Assistant general superintendents at large	Superintendents at large	Administrative assistants	District superintendent	Assistant district superintendents
Divisions.....	\$8, 470	\$7, 470	\$7, 270	\$6, 770	\$5, 970	-----	-----
Districts.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	\$6, 770	\$5, 970
	Examiner	Assistant examiner	General foremen	General foremen	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
Division offices.....	\$4, 896	\$4, 787	\$5, 270	\$5, 114	\$4, 896	\$4, 787	\$4, 570
District offices.....	4, 896	4, 787	5, 270	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
Railway post offices and highway post offices:							
Class B:							
Runs in which more than 60 feet of distributing space is authorized over entire length of the run in either direction not less than 5 days per week.....			5, 270	5, 114	-----	4, 787	-----
Runs with 60 feet or less of distributing space.....			-----	-----	4, 896	4, 787	-----
Class A.....			-----	-----	-----	-----	4, 570
	Number of employees in organization						
Transfer offices.....	61 and up	-----	5, 270	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	31 to 60	-----	-----	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	11 to 30	-----	-----	-----	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	1 to 10	-----	-----	-----	-----	4, 787	4, 570
Air mail fields.....	101 and up	-----	5, 270	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	31 to 100	-----	-----	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	1 to 30	-----	-----	-----	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
Terminals.....	251 and up	-----	5, 270	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	101 to 250	-----	-----	5, 114	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	31 to 100	-----	-----	-----	4, 896	4, 787	4, 570
	1 to 30 *	-----	-----	-----	-----	4, 787	4, 570

SEC. 12. Section 18 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The annual salaries of supervisory employees in the mail-equipment shops shall be as follows:

"Title	Per annum rates
Superintendent.....	\$7, 470
Senior assistant superintendent.....	6, 470
Assistant superintendent.....	5, 970
General foremen.....	5, 370
Engineer in charge.....	4, 870
Foremen of mechanics.....	4, 570
Foremen of repair.....	4, 370
Assistant foremen.....	4, 170"

SEC. 13. Section 19 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Storekeepers shall be paid annual salaries of \$4,896 and foremen shall be paid annual salaries of \$4,352."

SEC. 14. In the adjustment of assignments to grades, salaries, and positions to conform with the provisions of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this act—

(a) Postmasters, assistant postmasters, officers, and supervisory employees for whom annual salaries are provided in sections 8 (a), 9, 13 (a), 14 (a), 15 (a), 15 (b), 16 (a), 18 (a), and 19 (b) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this act shall be placed under the position title which covers their

regularly assigned duties and which is in accord with the applicable organizational unit structure as provided in such sections, and shall receive the annual salary provided for the position to which assigned.

(b) Employees (other than special mechanics, cost-accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen) for whom automatic grades and salaries are provided in section 11A of such act of July 6, 1945, as added by this act and who—

(1) on the effective date of this act, are in grades 1, 2, and 3 shall be placed in grade 1; and

(2) on the effective date of this act are in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 shall

be placed in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, respectively—

and shall receive the annual salary or hourly rate of pay of the grade in which placed.

(c) Special mechanics who, on the effective date of this act, are receiving basic annual salaries of \$3,670, \$3,770, and \$3,870, shall be placed in grade 1 and those receiving basic annual salaries of \$3,970 shall be placed in grade 2.

(d) Cost-accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen who, on the effective date of this act, are receiving basic annual salaries of \$4,070 and \$4,270 shall be placed in grade 1 and those receiving basic annual salaries of \$4,470 shall be placed in grade 2.

SEC. 15. (a) Employees who, under such act of July 6, 1945, as in effect prior to the effective date of this act, are entitled to automatic grade promotions on the effective date of this act, shall be given credit for their earned automatic grade promotion before applying the provisions of sections 4 and 14 of this act. Employees who, under such act of July 6, 1945, as in effect prior to the effective date of this act, would have been entitled to automatic grade promotions within 1 year from the effective date of this act, shall be given credit for the time served since their last promotion prior to the effective date of this act in determining eligibility for automatic grade promotions under the provisions of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this act.

(b) Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of this act shall not be considered as an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, in case of postal service employees who transfer or are transferred to a position coming within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 16. In the readjustment of salaries to conform with the provisions of this act, no postmaster, assistant postmaster, supervisor, or employee on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this act shall, by reason of the enactment of this act, receive an increase in basic annual salary of less than \$400 per annum or in excess of \$800, except that in the case of postmasters in offices of the fourth class no postmaster shall receive an increase of more than 20 percent of his present salary and in the case of employees paid on an hourly basis more than 20 cents per hour increase over his present compensation. None of the provisions of this act shall be construed to reduce the annual salary of any postmaster, assistant postmaster, supervisor, or employee on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this act. In the adjustment of the salaries of postmasters, assistant and supervisors in the field service of the Post Office Department, beginning on July 1, 1952, only 85 percent of the gross postal receipts in any post office shall be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or of postal employees of post offices.

SEC. 17. The act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service," approved May 21, 1946 (Public Law 386, 79th Cong.), section 101 of title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees," approved July 3, 1948 (Public Law 900, 80th Cong.), and section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service," approved October 28, 1949 (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.) are repealed.

SEC. 18. The third sentence of subsection (a) of the first section of the act entitled

"An act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service," approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 500, 81st Cong.), is amended by inserting after "5 percent per annum" the following: "or \$100 per annum, whichever is the lesser."

SEC. 19. The first proviso in the paragraph headed "Third class" in section 1 of the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1054), is repealed.

SEC. 20. The first section of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948 (Public Law 674, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out ", not exceeding 1 year of such service,"

SEC. 21. Subsection (e) of section 17 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In addition to the salaries provided in this section, each carrier in the rural delivery service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to (1) 9 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled or (2) \$3 per day, whichever is the greater. Payments for equipment and maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers."

SEC. 22. This act shall become effective as of July 1, 1951.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate bill 355 and insert the provisions of H. R. 244 as agreed to as follows: "That (a) each section of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 87th Cong.), as amended and supplemented, which provides annual automatic pay grades for positions in the postal field service is amended (1) by striking out the grade designations and rates of compensation provided for grades 1, 2, and 3, and (2) by renumbering, respectively, beginning with the number 1, in the same sequence in which they appear on the day before the effective date of this section, those grades which are on such day higher than grade 3. Any references to pay grades higher than grade 3 and any references with respect to the total number of grades in any class of position which are contained in such act or in any other law are hereby renumbered to conform to the changes made by this subsection.

"(b) Each employee who, on the day before the effective date of this section, is in grade 1, grade 2, or grade 3 shall as of such effective date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 by subsection (a).

"(c) Each employee on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this act for whom annual automatic pay grades are provided by the act of July 6, 1945, as amended and supplemented, who entered the postal field service after June 30, 1945, and who has not been advanced at least two annual automatic pay grades pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, section 2 of the act of March 6, 1946, as amended (Public Law 317, 79th Cong.), the act of July 31, 1946, as amended (Public Law 577, 79th Cong.), and section 2 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the act of October 28, 1949, as amended (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.), shall be advanced two annual automatic pay

grades, or, if such employee has been advanced one annual automatic pay grade pursuant to such provisions of law, he shall be advanced one annual automatic pay grade. Any such advancement in grade of an employee under this subsection shall be effective as of the effective date of this act and shall not be considered as a promotion for purposes of determining the date on which such employee is eligible for a promotion to the next higher grade.

"(d) Section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service,' approved October 28, 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. (a) Each postmaster, officer, and employee in the postal field service whose rate of compensation is prescribed by such act of July 6, 1945, as amended and supplemented (including amendments made by the first section of this act), shall receive additional compensation at the rate of \$400 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 20 percent of their basic annual compensation.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

"SEC. 3. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of this act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in the case of employees in the postal field service who transfer or are transferred to positions within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"SEC. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of July 1, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to reduce the number of grades for positions in the postal field service and to provide salary increases for personnel in such service."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to reduce the number of grades for positions in the postal field service and to provide salary increases for personnel in such service."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 244, was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDING ACT OF JULY 6, 1945, SO AS TO REDUCE NUMBER OF GRADES FOR VARIOUS POSITIONS UNDER SUCH ACT AND TO ADJUST SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order: to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4255) to amend the Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution from the Rules Committee calls for consideration of H. R. 4255 to adjust the salaries of postmasters, postal supervisors, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department.

The reclassification provided for in this legislation has been too long delayed. This legislation will eliminate injustice and inequities in salaries of postmasters and supervisors which has arisen since the last classification revision act in 1945. This revision has been recommended by the Postmaster General in his testimony before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and adopts basic classification schedules prepared by the Post Office Department.

Since 1925, there has been only one general reclassification of the salaries of employees in the field service in the Post Office Department. Since that time, a series of laws has been enacted providing increases in salaries of field postal employees, mostly by flat, across-the-board salary adjustments and this has brought about glaring inequities and distortions in the pay schedules of postmasters and supervisors.

As an example, in a number of post offices throughout the country, employees with overtime and night work receive as much income as the postmaster. The same distortions exist in regard to supervisors and postmasters; and in other instances, employees get larger pay checks than supervisors. The testimony which has been submitted before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is unanimous in agreement that a reclassification or revision of the salaries of postmasters and supervisors is long overdue.

The Congress should not lose sight of the fact that our postmasters are conducting the largest business in the country.

Postmasters and supervisors are bonded Government officials who are responsible for more than \$18,000,000,000 annually. They are also accountable for the collection of postal revenue totaling approximately \$1,600,000,000 annually. Postmasters and supervisors have the responsibility for the supervision of over 500,000 employees in the postal field service.

Under the civil-service regulations, postmasters are subject to the most rigid qualification requirements and must possess education, business experience, and executive ability in order to successfully carry out their duties.

Our postmasters are also charged with the responsibility of operating one of the largest banks in the world through the postal savings and money order systems.

They also direct one of the largest transportation operations in the world in the distribution of mails and postal freight.

Every top postal supervisor is a career employee with years of experience in every phase of postal operations. The lowest bracket of supervisor is required to have a minimum of 9 years in the post office. Supervisors must possess the experience and know-how, as bonded officers of the Government, to hold down their responsible positions.

This legislation is more or less of a companion bill to H. R. 244 which provides for a long-delayed and very necessary increase in salary for the postal workers.

This legislation provides that in no case shall a postmaster or supervisor receive an increase above his present salary of more than \$800 per annum.

Considering the drastic order of reduction in postal service in order to arrive at further economy, the postmasters and supervisors have been burdened with tremendous added work and responsibilities during recent years. In the Calumet industrial region in Indiana I know it to be a fact that over 50 percent of the postal personnel in the Hammond, Ind., post office has resigned to work in the industries for higher wages in order to meet the present high cost of living expenses. A similar employment situation exists in Gary, East Chicago, and Whiting, Ind. This condition has brought about an avalanche of headaches and extra work for the postmasters and supervisors in my area; but nevertheless, the postmasters, supervi-

sors, and experienced employees have cooperated greatly with the new and inexperienced help in order to give efficient postal service.

I am glad that this legislation has finally come to the floor of the House for action as I firmly believe that it will aid greatly in building up the morale of the postal service in our industrial and metropolitan areas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] has just explained, House Resolution 420 makes in order the bill H. R. 4255, which is a companion bill to the postal-pay legislation we have just approved. H. R. 4255 carries a well-deserved pay increase for postmasters, supervisors, and other field workers in the Post Office Department who have received no adjustment in compensation for some 26 or 27 years.

We have no requests for time on the rule from this side, Mr. Speaker. This rule was reported unanimously by the committee, and I am hopeful it will be adopted.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio why these postmasters have not been taken care of in the last 20 years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That, my friend, will have to be answered by those who control the Congress and its committees.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us Members have urged passage of this legislation for some time. It is only fair to our faithful postmasters.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter connected with the matter under consideration.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4255) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4255, with Mr. HERLONG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two bills on the agenda that have not been completed so far this afternoon, the present bill, H. R. 4255, and another bill, H. R. 339, for classified employees. I am hopeful that debate on these two bills will be curtailed and that we can complete action on both bills this afternoon. If the Members do not engage in protracted debate on this bill or the one for the classified employees we can complete both bills today and not have to come back tomorrow, so I am going to be as brief as I can about this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill reclassifies the salaries of postmasters and supervisors. There are about 42,000 postmasters and 26,000 supervisors.

This bill is just and deserving.

The last reclassification bill for postmasters and supervisors was passed in 1945. Since that time Congress has given three across-the-board increases to all postal employees, one of \$400 in 1946; one of \$450 in 1948; and another \$120 in 1949, making a total of \$970. These increases were given from top to bottom; they were given to the laborer as well as to the postmaster and to the supervisor. Naturally, when you continue to give your lower-class employees the same increase as your postmasters and supervisors you are going to throw out of kilter and out of balance the proper relationship between the salaries of postmasters and supervisors and the employees. For that reason this bill is necessary. It reclassifies the salaries so as to give all postmasters in first-class offices a raise of \$800; to postmasters in second-class offices a raise of from \$700 to \$800; for postmasters in third-class offices a raise from \$400 to \$600. Supervisory employees in first- and second-class post offices get increases under this bill that compare favorably with the raises for postmasters in those offices. The fourth-class postmasters get a less increase on account of the lower receipts of those offices.

Mr. Chairman, there is no controversy about this bill. The postmasters and supervisors are entitled to this increase because of the across-the-board increase given postal employees during the last 5 years. Let us give them a proper increase so that there will be a proper balance between their salaries and the other employees' salaries because of the great responsibilities and duties of the postmasters and the supervisors.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation provides for the reclassification of the salaries of 42,000 postmasters and 26,000 supervisors. The bill is predicated upon the passage of House bill 244 by provid-

ing that no postmaster or supervisor whose salary is reclassified under its provisions will receive an increase above his present salary of more than \$800 under the combined legislation—House bill 244 and House bill 4255.

The salary schedules for the postmasters and supervisors are outlined in the report and will range from \$13,770 for the highest paid postmaster in a first-class post office to \$4,470 for dispatchers in motor vehicle service.

The bill is retroactive to July 16, 1951, and will increase the expenditures of the Post Office Department by \$16,900,000 annually.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is hereby amended in the following respects:

(1) Sections of such act providing four pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1 and 2, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 3 and 4, and any references thereto, as grades 1 and 2, respectively.

(2) Sections of such act providing six pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, and 3, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 4, 5, and 6, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

(3) Sections of such act providing seven pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, 3, and 4, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 5, 6, 7, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

(4) Sections of such act providing eight pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 6, 7, and 8, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

(5) Sections of such act providing nine pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 7, 8, and 9, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

(6) Sections of such act providing 10 pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 7, 8, 9, and 10, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively.

(7) Sections of such act providing 11 pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade des-

ignations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

(8) Sections of such act providing 17 pay grades for any class of positions are amended (A) by striking out the grade designations and salaries provided for grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and any references thereto, and (B) by redesignating grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, and any references thereto, as grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively.

(b) (1) Employees holding positions within classes for which four pay grades were established by such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, who on the day before the effective date of this act are in grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 pursuant to this act, and those who, on such date, are in grades higher than grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 2 pursuant to this act.

(2) Employees holding positions within classes for which six, seven, eight, or nine pay grades were established by such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, who on the day before the effective date of this act are in grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 pursuant to this act, and those who, on such date, are in grades higher than grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 3 pursuant to this act.

(3) Employees holding positions within classes for which 10 pay grades were established by such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, who on the day before the effective date of this act are in grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 pursuant to this act, those who on such date are in grade 3 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 3 pursuant to this act, and those on such date are in grades higher than grade 3 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 4 pursuant to this act.

(4) Employees holding positions within classes for which 11 pay grades were established by such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, who on the day before the effective date of this act are in grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 pursuant to this act, those who on such date are in grade 3 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 3 pursuant to this act, those who on such date are in grade 4 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 4 pursuant to this act, and those who on such date are in a grade higher than grade 4 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 5 pursuant to this act.

(5) Employees holding positions within classes for which 17 pay grades were established by such act of July 16, 1945, as amended, who on the day before the effective date of this act are in grade 1 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 1 pursuant to this act, those who on such date are in grade 3 shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 3 pursuant to this act. Employees holding such positions who on the day before the effective date of this act are in grades 4 to 9, inclusive, and are assigned to organizations where grade 9 of the act of July 6, 1945, was the top automatic grade shall as of such date be placed in the grade designated as grade 3 pursuant to this act. Employees holding such positions who on the day before the effective date of the act are in grade 4, and are assigned to organizations where grade 11 of the act of July 6, 1945, was the top automatic grade shall as of such date be placed in the grade desig-

at post offices of the first class shall be annual salaries, to be fixed by the Postmaster General based upon gross postal receipts as shown in the quarterly returns of the respective post offices for the calendar year immediately preceding, at the following rates: *Provided*, That subsection (c) of section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 285), as amended, is hereby repealed retroactive to January 1, 1944, and thereafter the gross postal receipts shall be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or other employees, whose compensation or allowances are based on the annual receipts of such offices: *Provided further*, That in fixing the salaries of the postmaster and supervisory employees in the post office at Washington, District of Columbia, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, add not to exceed 75 percent to the gross receipts of that office:

Gross receipts	Per annum rates						
	Assistant superintend- ents of finance	Assistant superintend- ents of money orders	Auditor	Station ex- aminers	General fore- men	Foremen	Clerks in charge
\$3,000,000 to \$6,999,999.99	\$5, 270	\$4, 970	\$4, 870	\$4, 970	\$5, 000	\$4, 800	\$4, 600
\$1,500,000 to \$2,999,999.99	4, 870	4, 870	4, 870	4, 870	4, 900	4, 800	4, 600
\$1,000,000 to \$1,499,999.99	4, 870	4, 870	4, 870	4, 870	4, 900	4, 800	4, 600
\$600,000 to \$999,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$500,000 to \$599,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$400,000 to \$499,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$300,000 to \$399,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$250,000 to \$299,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$200,000 to \$249,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$150,000 to \$199,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$120,000 to \$149,999.99						4, 800	4, 600
\$90,000 to \$119,999.99						4, 800	4, 600

2 or more buildings with—
50,000,000 cubic feet and up.....
15,000,000 to 49,999,999 cubic feet

"Cubic content of buildings		Per annum rates									
		General superintendent	Assistant general superintendent	Superintending engineer	Superintendent of building	Assistant superintendent of building	Chief engineer	Assistant chief engineer	Assistant superintending engineer	Engineers	Inspection engineers; mechanical engineers
1 or more buildings with—											
40,000,000 cubic feet and up.....					\$6,770	\$5,770	\$6,770	\$4,970		\$4,970	
20,000,000 to 39,999,999 cubic feet.....					6,700	5,700	6,600	4,970		4,970	
15,000,000 to 19,999,999 cubic feet.....					6,270	5,270	6,270	4,970		4,970	
10,000,000 to 14,999,999 cubic feet.....				\$6,270	5,970	4,970	5,970	4,970	\$4,970	4,800	
6,000,000 to 9,999,999 cubic feet.....				6,000	5,670		5,670		4,970	4,800	
3,000,000 to 5,999,999 cubic feet.....				5,600	5,370		5,370			4,800	
1,000,000 to 2,999,999 cubic feet.....				5,300	5,070		5,070			4,800	
750,000 to 999,999 cubic feet.....				4,370							
500,000 to 749,999 cubic feet.....				4,170							
Less than 500,000 cubic feet.....				4,170							

Number of employees supervised	Superintendent of shops	Assistant superintendent of shops	General foremen of mechanics	Foremen of mechanics	General foremen of laborers	Foremen of laborers	Foremen of elevator operators	Captain of guard	Lieutenant of guard	Chief telephone operators	Assistant chief telephone operators	Foremen	Clerks in charge
151 and up.....	\$6,770	\$5,970			\$4,770		\$4,470	\$4,600					
101 to 150.....	6,770	5,970			4,600		4,470	4,600					
61 to 100.....	6,570	5,570			4,400	\$4,200	4,400	4,600				\$4,800	\$4,600
41 to 60.....	6,370	5,370	\$5,200		4,200	4,200	4,400	4,600				4,800	4,600
31 to 40.....			5,200	\$4,800	4,200	4,200	4,400	4,400	\$4,200	\$4,270	\$4,000	4,800	4,600
21 to 30.....			5,200	4,800	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,200	4,270	4,000	4,800	4,600
11 to 20.....			5,200	4,800	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,200	4,200	4,270	4,000	4,800	4,600
1 to 10.....			5,200	4,800	4,000	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,270	4,000	4,800	4,600

"(2) Section 14 (e) of such act is amended by striking out 'and chief telephone operators.'

"(3) Section 14 (f) of such act is amended by striking out 'assistant chief telephone operators.'

"(h) (1) Section 15 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The annual salaries of inspectors in charge, assistant inspectors in charge, and supervisory employees at division headquarters of the Inspection Service shall be as follows:

"Title	Per annum rates
Post office inspector in charge.....	\$8,470
Assistant post-office inspector in charge.....	7,770
Superintendent.....	5,770
Assistant superintendent.....	5,270
Chiefs of section.....	5,170

"(2) That portion of section 15 (b) of such act which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Post office inspectors shall be divided into seven grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1.....	\$5,570
Grade 2.....	5,870
Grade 3.....	5,970
Grade 4.....	6,370
Grade 5.....	6,770
Grade 6.....	7,270
Grade 7.....	7,770

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 5.

"(1) (1) Section 16 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The annual salaries of officers and supervisory employees in the postal transportation service shall be as follows:

"Organizations		Per annum rates						
		General superintendent	Assistant general superintendent	Assistant general superintendents at large	Superintendents at large	Administrative assistants	District superintendents	Assistant district superintendents
Divisions.....		\$8,470	\$7,470	\$7,270	\$6,770	\$5,900		
Districts.....							\$6,770	\$5,970
		Examiner	Assistant examiner	General foremen	General foremen	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
Division offices.....		\$4,900	\$4,800	\$5,270	\$5,100	\$4,900	\$4,800	\$4,600
District offices.....		4,900	4,800	5,270	5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Railway post offices and highway post offices:								
Class B:								
Runs in which more than 60 feet of distributing space is authorized over entire length of the run in either direction not less than 5 days per week.....				5,270	5,100		4,800	
Runs with 60 feet or less of distributing space.....						4,900	4,800	
Class A.....								4,600
		Number of employees in the organization						
Transfer offices.....		61 and up.....		5,270	5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		31 to 60.....			5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		11 to 30.....				4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		1 to 10.....					4,800	4,600
Air-mail fields.....		101 and up.....		5,270	5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		31 to 100.....			5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		1 to 30.....				4,900	4,800	4,600
Terminals.....		251 and up.....		5,270	5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		101 to 250.....			5,100	4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		31 to 100.....				4,900	4,800	4,600
Do.....		1 to 30.....					4,800	4,600

"(2) Section 16 (b) of such act is amended—

"(A) by striking out '14 grades' and inserting in lieu thereof '8 grades'; and

"(B) by striking out so much of the table therein as follows grade 8.

"(3) Section 16 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the third and fourth sentences, including the proviso.

"(4) Section 16 (d) of such act is amended by striking out all after the first sentence.

"(5) Section 16 (e) of such act is amended by striking out all after the first sentence.

"(6) Section 16 (g) of such act is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence as precedes the first proviso.

"(7) Section 16 (h) of such act is amended by striking out the portion thereof which precedes the proviso.

"(j) Section 18 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) The annual salaries of supervisory employees in the Mail Equipment Shops shall be as follows:

"Title	Per annum rates
Superintendent.....	\$7,470
Senior assistant superintendent.....	6,470
Assistant superintendent.....	5,970
General foremen.....	5,370
Engineers in charge.....	4,870
Foremen of mechanics.....	4,570
Foremen of repair.....	4,370
Assistant foremen.....	4,170

"(2) Cost accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen shall be divided into three grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1.....	\$4,470
Grade 2.....	4,670
Grade 3.....	4,870

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 3.

"(k) Section 19 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Storekeepers shall be paid annual salaries of \$4,900 and foremen shall be paid annual salaries of \$4,400.

"(1) In the adjustment of assignments to grades, annual salaries, and positions to conform with the provisions of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this section—

"(1) postmasters, assistant postmasters, officers, and supervisory employees for whom annual salaries are provided in sections 8 (a), 9, 13 (a) (1), (14) (a), 15 (a), 16 (a), 18 (a) (1), and 19 (b) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this section, shall be placed under the position title which covers their regularly assigned duties and which is in accord with the applicable organizational unit structure as provided in such sections and shall be placed under the annual salary provided for the position to which assigned; and

"(2) employees for whom grades and annual salaries are provided by sections 13 (a) (2) and 18 (a) (2) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this section, shall be placed in the grade which provides an annual salary which is identical with their annual salary on the effective date of this act.

"(m) None of the provisions of this section shall be construed to reduce the annual salary of any postmaster, assistant postmaster, supervisor, or employee on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this act; but no such postmaster, assistant postmaster, supervisor, or employee shall by reason of the enactment of this act, receive an increase in annual salary at a rate in excess of \$400.

"(n) The salaries provided in sections 8 (a), 9, 13 (a) (1), 13 (a) (2), 14 (a), 15 (a), 15 (b), 16 (a), 18 (a) (1), 18 (a) (2), and 19 (b) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this section shall not be subject to

any increase by the application of any law enacted after the effective date of such act of July 6, 1945, and prior to the effective date of this act.

"(o) The first proviso in the paragraph headed 'Third class' in section 1 of the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1054), is repealed.

"Sec. 2. The third sentence of subsection (a) of the first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service', approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 500, 81st Cong.), is amended by inserting after '5 percent per annum' the following: 'or \$100 per annum, whichever is the lesser.'

"Sec. 3. (a) This act shall become effective as of July 16, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 16, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, assistant postmaster, and supervisory officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERLONG, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4255) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 420, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 339) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order the consideration of H. R. 339, which is a companion bill to the two measures upon which we have acted favorably here today. It provides well-merited pay increases for the Federal employees under the Classification Act of 1949, in the Foreign Service, in the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, in the judicial system, and in the legislative branch.

The record made by the committee and here in the debate today is replete with illustrations as to why it is good business to provide at least this amount of a pay raise. This action recommended by the committee in H. R. 339 will bring the pay of classified employees into a better relation with that paid in private industry. It will help these employees meet the mounting cost of living. It will help stem the flow of personnel away from Federal employment to private industry which has been costing the Federal Government in the hiring and training thereby made necessary.

All of the arguments made in regard to the necessity for postal pay increases can be made with equal force in behalf of the classified worker. It is these arguments which prove it economical for the Congress to vote this \$417,445,600 pay increase for the 1,043,614 employees under the Classification Act and other acts included in this legislation.

Coming from the First Congressional District, which includes the high-cost living areas of Bremerton and Seattle, I could cite case upon case where workers with fixed incomes have had to seek side employment outside of the Federal Government in order to provide necessities for their families in this time of inflation. This cannot but result in decreased efficiency and the Federal Government is the loser.

In order to meet living costs, the Washington State Credit Union Exam-

iner showed that early this year 602 Federal employees had borrowed \$21,-530.32. A Federal union local survey showed that of its members 41 percent had taken additional jobs and that the same percentage of their wives had gone to work to help meet family obligations.

These facts are indications as to why in 1 month, one Federal department in the Seattle region reported 171 new appointments and 126 quits. I was unable to learn the exact cost of this employee turn-over.

I do hope that no effort will be made to remove the retroactive feature of this bill. In going back merely to July 1, the bill does only partial justice for the employee has been suffering from the increased cost of living most certainly since the first of the year.

Under collective bargaining it is a custom for the employee to seek, and he usually wins, retroactive pay from the start of negotiations. We could make a good case here today, under this precedent, for the Federal pay to be retroactive to January 3, 1951, the day upon which H. R. 339 was introduced.

I urge speedy approval of this resolution and of H. R. 339. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the resolution. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House that, when we come under the 5-minute rule, I shall offer an amendment on page 6 which refers to the Capitol Hill employees. This bill, H. R. 339, provides for a flat \$400-a-year raise. The Senate bill differs from this one in that they raise all other classified employees 10 percent with the exception of the Capitol Hill employees, and Senator MONROE said it was a mistake on his part when he introduced the amendment. The figure is 8.8 percent in the Senate bill. It is my intention to introduce this amendment on page 6, section 2 (a) to correspond with the Senate bill so that the raise for the Capitol Hill employees and the legislative employees, shall be not less than \$400 or 10 percent, whichever is higher, provided that no increase shall exceed \$800 per year. That will be the same provision that is included in the Senate bill, which this will make it conform to.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will actually take care of the people who run Capitol Hill, because there is no more loyal set of workers anywhere than the people in your own offices. They work harder than the people downtown and, without exception, every Member of this House will say that they are underpaid. They are not under civil service; you can fire them whenever you want to. They take a vacation at your discretion; they have no special privileges, no sick leave, and unless you take care of them yourselves, they will not be taken care of.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This entire matter can be worked out in conference. There is no necessity for any

amendment as proposed by my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I want to make sure that it is taken care of.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Inadvertently the Senate limited the 8.8-percent clause for the legislative employees. It was an oversight, because all other employees were given 10 percent. This whole matter can be worked out between the conferees of the House and the Senate. The House bill provides for \$400 and the Senate bill for \$800.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman see that that is done in conference?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That will take care of that.

Mr. SUTTON. I want to make sure it is taken care of. That is the reason I shall offer my amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman should pursue his amendment and permit the House to make that correction. I congratulate him. Let us be fair to our employees on the Hill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not know whether this question has been raised, but I should like to be sure that all of our congressional employees are remembered in this bill proportionately.

Mr. SUTTON. They are, with the exception of the Members.

Mr. DINGELL. This does not apply to the Members, no. I also want to do something if it is at all possible for the District policemen, firemen, and school teachers.

Mr. SUTTON. The Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I am a member, reported out this morning a pay increase for those people.

Mr. DINGELL. That is already taken care of?

Mr. SUTTON. We reported it out of the Committee on the District of Columbia this morning.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to hear that, because I did not think we were justified for the sake of safeguarding any jurisdictional privilege of any committee in freezing out the District of Columbia employees. I think the sentiment on both sides of the House would sustain an immediate increase for these faithful people.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The gentleman's amendment would apply to section 2, subsection (b), increased pay for legislative employees?

Mr. SUTTON. No, it would refer to section 2, subparagraph (a) which states:

Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of \$400 per annum.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise at this time to voice my support for this rule and for the bill which is the subject matter thereof. This bill, like the two bills we have just passed, will increase the salaries of Federal employees. I have said repeatedly that all Government employees, regardless of their classification, make up as large a group of honest, loyal, hard-working citizens as we can find anywhere. They are deserving of every possible consideration at our hands and they are entitled to the measure of increased compensation provided for by this bill, to enable them to meet in part the increased cost of living.

I have been urging increases of pay for Federal employees of all grades and classes from the lowest to the highest ever since I came to Congress, and doing it at every possible opportunity, in campaign time and out of campaign time. I have never for one moment feared that my advocacy of that cause would lose me any votes. To those who have been shrieking for economy in Government, I have consistently replied that the way to economize in Government is not by requiring Government employees to work for less than fair compensation that will give them the opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living.

Having in mind, too, much of the talk we hear today about corruption in government, let me say that the principle difference between the bad we find in government and the bad we find in private industry is that with rare exceptions, no public official is corrupt until a private citizen comes upon the scene to corrupt him. We get as good or as bad government as we deserve and as we want.

There can be no corrupt government without a corrupt citizenry.

When government will pay its employees full and fair compensation, enough for them to live on the scale at which the public expects them to live, and when the public stops calling every public official a dirty politician or a damn bureaucrat, and when the public will demand that every cheat, fraud, and briber be dealt with according to law, we will get better public officials and have a better Government. There is no doubt but that the wrongdoers in government, percentage-wise and numerically, are a much smaller group than found in other walks of life, yet Mr. John Q. Public prefers to believe and to charge that all officialdom is crooked. That small part of officialdom which is crooked reflects the thinking and conduct of crooked citizens. There can be no strong government without a strong people. There can be no moral government without a moral people.

A few days ago I received a letter from one of our top Government officials, entirely unsolicited, and with no thought in mind by him that what he wrote to me might be used in connection with this bill. He tells the story so well that I

cannot let this opportunity go by without reading these short excerpts from his letter:

I agree with you entirely that the loss to the Government is as great or greater from being unable to hold employees once trained than from failure to attract personnel from private industry for top jobs.

Employment in the Government has many compensations, particularly to those of us who are privileged to occupy positions of authority. The high purpose and degree of responsibility associated with most of our work, the variety of experience, and the personal and official relationships involved, truly are, as it is said, "more than money can buy."

I also agree, therefore, that it is not entirely relevant to draw comparisons from private industry in determining the proper compensation for Federal officials. It is, however, clearly necessary and appropriate to offer such compensation as will provide for a reasonable rising standard of living at all levels of responsibility. While that would fall far short of the financial standard for success in private industry, it would substantially minimize the undesirable pressure on experienced employees to leave the Government.

We will have a better Government if we render to Government employees and officials the respect that is their due, and if we tender to them the compensation that is their right. It may be true that no one has a right to work for the Government and no one need work for the Government unless he wants to, but neither Government nor the citizens that make up the Government have any right to expect anyone to serve them without adequate compensation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am for the measure increasing the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government. I believe it will aid deserving employees, and in a measure will offset the greatly increased cost-of-living expenses incurred due to inflation.

I do feel that our legislative employees should be included, too.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Washington has explained, House Resolution 421 makes in order H. R. 339, a bill to adjust the compensation of the classified workers of the Federal Government.

This measure, as has been mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee, also carries a provision which would increase the compensation of legislative employees. However, I want to make it very clear, for the record, that this legislation does not in any way increase the compensation which is paid or is presumed to be paid to the Members of Congress. The salaries of the Members of Congress are in no way affected by this legislation.

This bill is somewhat different from the companion bill that was passed earlier today for the benefit of postal employees. It is also different from the measure which passed the other body to adjust the compensation of classified employees of the Government. The bill on

this same subject, which passed the other body provides for a 10-percent increase for classified workers but, as the gentleman from Tennessee has pointed out, carries an increase of only 8.4 percent for legislative employees.

The bill affecting postal workers, which passed the other body, and the one which passed this House a little earlier today, contains a minimum increase of \$400 for each employee. This House bill carries a \$400 minimum increase for classified employees but provides no percentage increase as in the Senate bill on the same subject. In other words, the Senate bill for classified workers has no \$400 minimum increase, but simply a 10-percent increase. This bill contains a \$400 flat pay increase, but does not provide the 10-percent increase. Therefore, it will certainly be necessary to adjust the differences in the two measures between the two bodies, which I am sure will be done.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I compliment the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] for proposing to introduce an amendment which would adjust the differences between the two Houses. I would like to be sure that our congressional employees get as much of a raise as anyone else in the Federal Government because they do as much work, if not more.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I take it then, that my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, would like to see a minimum of \$400 provided for the classified employees in the lower brackets, and at the same time in the interest of fairness to recognize those employees in the higher brackets by a fair percentage increase in their salaries. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It seems to me that if legislation is enacted which contains a floor or a minimum increase of \$400 for one group of Government employees, and a greater increase of up to \$800 through a percentage formula, that the same provision should be carried for the benefit of all workers in the Government.

Mr. DINGELL. I understand the gentleman correctly, do I not, in that assumption?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I think there has to be some sort of floor provided for.

Mr. DINGELL. I think it is entirely fair and ought to be applied in this instance.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does this \$400 increase affect the base pay of legislative employees?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I understand that the \$400 increase provided in this bill will be added to the present total compensation received by the employee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do the percentage figures put in apply to the base pay or to the total?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, the percentage figure would apply, as it is now applied in the Senate bill, to the pay and the actual amount received, and not to the base pay.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 339) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 339, with Mr. GATHINGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill covers about 1,044,000 employees. It includes all classified civil-service employees, of whom there are about 1,000,000. Then there are about 44,000 additional employees, in addition to the 1,000,000 classified employees covered by this bill, who are not civil-service employees. They comprise physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; also the Foreign Service employees; secretaries and law clerks of the United States circuit court and district court judges, and the legislative employees of Congress.

Now, this is a very simple bill. It provides that every employee included under this bill shall receive a salary increase of \$400; no more and no less. In other words, an employee in the lowest salary bracket will receive \$400, and an employee in the highest bracket will receive \$400. This bill does not have the endorsement of the Civil Service Commission or the President. The President said that this bill was wrong because it was not on a percentage basis. He said it would distort the classification fixture and give all employees, from bottom to top, the same amount. Well, that is true. It does do that. But the committee saw fit to bring out this kind of a bill during my absence due to illness.

The cost of the bill is \$417,000,000. I do not think there is any controversy about the bill. This legislation will finally have to be worked out in conference.

The other body passed a bill which would give a percentage increase of 10 percent to all employees, with a maxi-

mum of \$800. This bill only gives \$400 to everyone included. So naturally this bill will have to be worked out in conference, and the differences between the Senate and the House adjusted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the gentleman say that this bill would add \$417,000,000 to the Federal payroll?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly correct. The three bills that have been before the House today will cost a total of \$675,000,000.

I would have offered an amendment to strike out the retroactive date to July 1, provided a similar amendment had been adopted to the postal employees pay bill. But in view of the fact that the House saw fit not to adopt my amendment to strike out the retroactive date to July 1, 1951, I will not offer such an amendment to this bill, because certainly all employees should be treated the same about the effective date of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. What does subsection E mean on page 5 of the bill? The last paragraph on page 5.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It speaks for itself.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, then, do I understand correctly that the agencies of Government must save the money out of their appropriation to pay the pay increases.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. You mean they must save the money out of their appropriation to pay these increases?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] is the author of that section, and he can explain it to you as it was adopted by the committee in my absence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important piece of legislation. I suggested earlier in the day that we had spent a considerable amount of time arguing, trying to determine whether we should charge some \$12,000,000 to a group who used the mail service, or whether we would just go ahead and charge it to the taxpayers. It took us all day to decide that. We are now going to spend in a short time the item of something over \$417,000,000, and I think it is extremely important that we at least know what we are doing.

This bill does affect more than a million employees; it affects all persons employed by the United States Government except those in the wage boards and those in the postal service, for which legislation has already been approved. This legislation, as our chairman has told you, comes to the floor with the recommendation of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil

Service, but it also should be explained that it does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget; neither does it have the approval of the Civil Service Commission. So far as this House is concerned we are on our own; it is for us to decide whether we want to approve this legislation or not, as it should be. But I think that situation ought to be pointed out. This bill provides for an increase of \$400 for each and every one of the 1,044,000-plus employees and those who have already been described to you by the chairman of this committee.

This legislation comes before you after a considerable amount of discussion and long hearings. It was determined, as I told you before with respect to postal employees, that if this is a cost-of-living proposal, which I think it is, then all Government employees should be treated alike in that respect; so that is what this committee proposed to do. The other body in giving consideration to similar legislation put a floor or minimum of \$400 for these Federal employees, and a maximum of \$800; otherwise 10 percent. Here is an analysis of the bill:

Coverage: One million and forty-four thousand employees, including, first, classified employees; second, physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration; third, Foreign Service employees; fourth, secretaries and law clerks of the United States circuit and district court judges; and fifth, legislative employees.

Salary increase: An increase of \$400—20 cents an hour for hourly or part-time employees—in basic compensation, subject to retirement deductions and used as a basis upon which to compute overtime and night differential.

Increased annual cost: Four hundred and seventeen million dollars.

Effective date: The first pay period following June 30, 1951, except that no retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable to any individual not in the service of the United States—including the Armed Forces—or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment, other than those who retire during such period.

Other provisions: Section 1 (d) amends the Classification Act of 1949 to provide that increases in compensation granted employees by law after June 30, 1951, shall not operate to deprive such employees of within-grade salary advancements under the Classification Act.

Section 1 (e) provides that except for the field service of the Post Office Department, and in those cases where the President determines a department or individual establishment, or any part thereof, is engaged in activities essential to the national defense, the departments and agencies in the executive branch shall absorb the increased cost of the salary increases within the appropriation or funds made available to such department or agency for personal services for fiscal year 1952.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield briefly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does not the gentleman from Kansas feel that the

AAA or the PMA employees in the States who are really Federal employees under the Department of Agriculture and who were not included should be included too, for the raise?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that no one appeared before the committee that I know about, unless it was the gentleman from Oklahoma himself, in support of his proposal. I may say that the committee did not give consideration to that question because as he just stated there is a question as to whether you designate them as Federal employees or partial State employees. I would say to the gentleman, however, that they ought to be compensated for the services they render in line with the compensation paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am somewhat uncertain as to just how this operates as far as the legislative employees are concerned. For instance, this applies to those who are presently on the payroll. It does not affect the base, I am informed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not affect the base; it simply means that if you have someone on the payroll who is presently getting \$3,000 you add \$400. It is for you to decide what the employee ought to receive; that is an adjustment you make because that adjustment is under your control. To whatever you allow a person who is employed by you there is added an additional \$400 under this legislation. There is no percentage basis attached to it at all.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does it follow from that in the event additional legislative employees come onto the payroll after the enactment of this bill that they, too, get the \$400?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You would go down there and fix the salary that the individual is to receive. When you have talked to the Disbursement Office and determined what the salary shall be as it is presently fixed, there will be added to that \$400, but you do not take that into consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will this amount be added to the base we are allowed for secretarial service?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It will be added to the amount the Member is allowed for employee hire.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Then it will vary with each office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That depends upon yourself. If you go down there and figure out that you are going to pay your employees \$2,700 base pay, or whatever it is called, then there will be a percentage added, as is done presently. In other words your base pay is not what the employee gets, as you know, but there are additions. After the complex computations have been made, then there will be an additional \$400 added to that amount; is that clear?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I stated this legislation does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The report from the Bureau of the Budget is that the

increase should be at the rate of 7 percent. The same thing is true with respect to the Civil Service Commission, except there is an adjustment there of between 7 and 7.5 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are the employees of the District of Columbia, including policemen, firemen, and teachers, in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should have mentioned that. We had them in the bill originally, then afterwards, at the request of members of the committee who were also members of the District of Columbia Committee they were withdrawn. I want to make that correction in my statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In our committee this morning and tomorrow we are going to try to decide that question relative to the policemen, firemen, teachers and other employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The employees of the District of Columbia were included in the bill originally, but at the request of two or three members of our committee who are also members of the District of Columbia Committee that portion of the bill was stricken out with the understanding that the Committee on the District of Columbia will provide and support legislation on this subject matter.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. If we do not have a particular employee on our legislative payroll now but we appoint a person we will say one day after this act becomes effective, does that person then get the benefit of the \$400 increase?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman explain to me the acrobatics of the Corbett concoction in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think I shall have to agree with the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania submitted that proposal. It was his hope that the situation could be worked out whereby these agencies might, even though they pay more in salaries, employ a less number of employees. But again I think it is only fair that the gentleman from Pennsylvania explain that proposal himself.

Mr. RIVERS. If we keep in here the Corbett idea you cannot raise anybody anything?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It just depends upon whether or not the agency can get along with less employees. There are quite a number of agencies that are pretty well overstaffed. I suppose we will have a question of whether or not a certain agency is overstaffed and another one not overstaffed. That is a problem to be worked out. But again I will leave it to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to explain himself.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose you have four people on your staff in the office one day after this bill goes into effect and you employ a fifth secretary; does that fifth secretary get the salary that you fix plus the \$400 provided in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. You go down there and fix the salary at the disbursement office, if you want to put it that way. There is that \$400 to be added to it, or, putting it another way, if you decide to pay the individual \$4,000 certainly you will take into consideration the fact that you have \$400 more down there to pay that employee. Is that clear?

Mr. DONDERO. It is clear.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If your decision is not to raise the pay of any of your employees, yet you have the \$400 for four employees, \$1,600, to use if you so desire or to turn back?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You do not have to use it. You can turn it back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If your decision is not to raise the salaries of your employees, if you make an agreement or have an understanding as to the pay for the year and decide not to give them the \$400, can you do that under this bill, or not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You will have to go down to the Disbursing Office and readjust the amount you will allow that individual, otherwise he will automatically get the \$400.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then you will have \$1,600 to put somebody else on the pay roll, if you desire.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. Before closing I want to call attention again to the fact that the government is higher than ever before and that employees are being hired at the rate of 1,500 a week, and the end is not yet.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of giving all Federal employees the same pay boost that we have given to the postal employees. In the original bill as introduced, H. R. 339, a 17 percent increase was proposed. Chairman Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission testified that he felt a 20 to 25 percent increase was necessary in order to bring rates up to the increased cost of living. I hope that this bill will be approved, with one exception. I think we should strike out paragraph "e" on page 5 starting on line 19.

What this paragraph "e" really means is that you take away the increase called for in this bill. You say that no additional appropriation shall be made to the various departments. So you are voting for an increase but you are not giving it to those employees. I think it is unfair. I think it is unsound. If we are going to treat all the Federal employees in the same way, this provision should be taken out. I intend to introduce an amendment to do so.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Would this provision apply to the employees in the Legislative branch?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Then there would be no resultant increase?

Mr. RHODES. There would be no increase, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is the gentleman talking about section (e)?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. CORBETT. That applies only to the executive branch. It says so in the language.

Mr. RHODES. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. You will find it on page 5 and following. It is only applicable to the executive branch and only applicable to the nondefense agencies, and not to the postmasters.

Mr. RHODES. I think that every department of government should be treated the same way. Certainly the employees in the executive department deserve the same kind of treatment as the employees of any other department.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Then if you think all should be treated alike, would you not be in favor, in conference, of allowing the State AAA or PMA agricultural officials to have the same rate of increase?

Mr. RHODES. I think they are entitled to it also.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. I want to say also that I believe that all Federal employees, including District employees, should be given the same increase. The provision to include District employees was in the bill, but it was taken out at a meeting of the committee at the request of members of the District Committee. I would favor an amendment adopted to have the District employees included in this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have just passed two bills to increase the salaries of postal employees and the postmasters and other supervisors. In neither of those bills were there any limitations such as have been imposed in this bill by paragraph (e) which appears on page 5 of the bill and runs over onto page 6. The sum and substance of this paragraph is that after providing an increase for the Federal employees other than those of the Post Office Department, who have already been taken care of, we do not give them the increase unless savings can be made out of money already appropriated except in those depart-

ments or agencies which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense. We further exempt the Post Office Department in itself. In other words, this section shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department, so that is exempt. Then the paragraph further says that it shall not apply to any department or independent establishment, or any part thereof, which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense.

In other words, we say, "We are increasing your salary," and then by this language we say to those agencies or departments that the President does not determine to be essential to the national defense, "We are not increasing your salary." What hypocrisy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I believe the gentleman misunderstands the language of the provision because it makes the increase mandatory for the individual employee but requires that it be accomplished within the existing budget of the nondefense agency to this effect, that the agency head, at the time when people voluntarily separate themselves from the service, has, let us say, \$100,000 to use for these increases.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand.

Mr. CORBETT. Is it clear, however, that the raise is mandatory for the individual?

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the language of this bill, I cannot see how any head of an agency can carry out this provision. If you give increases you have to make large reductions in the number of employees. For example, the budget estimate for the Civil Service Commission was \$23,000,000 and it finally received \$17,500,000. Under this bill the increase would be about \$1,800,000. Giving that \$1,800,000 increase would have to be done within the present appropriation. No deficiency or supplemental appropriation can be asked for because that is prohibited by the language of paragraph (e). They would have to reduce the number of their employees sharply in order to give the increase provided in this bill. We already have the Jensen amendment which provides for reductions. I cannot in all honesty see how any department head can accomplish it.

Certainly the Interior Department could not be considered essential to national defense. Parts of it could be so considered, but I doubt if the over-all department could be considered as essential to national defense. I doubt if the Department of Commerce as a whole could be considered as essential to national defense. I doubt if the General Accounting Office as a whole could be considered as essential to national defense. I doubt if the Civil Service Commission as a whole could be considered as essential to the national defense. There are other agencies that certainly no man, you or I or the President, could determine to be essential to the national

defense to make them exempt so that they could ask for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation in order to meet the increase provided for in this bill.

Therefore, by reason of paragraph (e), I find myself in the position of saying to 1,044,000 employees, whom the chairman refers to as being benefited by this bill, through getting this increase, "I am voting for your increase, but in the case of a great majority of you I am not voting for this increase by reason of this language in the bill."

I submit that there is no other construction that can be placed upon paragraph (e) on page 5 other than that a very substantial number of the 1,044,000 employees who expect under this bill to get an increase are not in fact going to get an increase.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more thought which I wanted to discuss, getting away from the subject at hand entirely. Here we are, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and 96 Members of the Senate. Our salary is \$12,500 with a \$2,500 expense account. I think it is unfortunate that we do not give a little consideration to our salaries. The people of your district, and the people of my district, want us to be independent. They do not want us, or expect us, to be here in Washington where many of us, who do not have some kind of outside, independent income, are overspending or spending more than we receive through salaries and our expense account. I realize that so far as our salaries are concerned, probably an amendment to this bill might be subject to a point of order. On various occasions I have said that the salary of a Member of Congress ought to be at least \$25,000 a year. I have the courage to vote for an increase for myself as a legislator and I know my colleagues have. We are giving increases to the postal employees, which they deserve, both in the supervisory positions and the nonsupervisory positions, and we are giving increases to employees covered by this bill—and properly so. I think we ought to consider ourselves also. I hope the appropriate committee of the Congress, between now and next January, or in the early part of the next session will approach this question and report a bill. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote for a \$25,000 salary for myself. I have the courage to do it—we all have. I know—I am not picking myself out as the individual with the courage to do so. But, we ought to do it, and the people of our districts will support us. I hope that will be done at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, in regard to this controversial section E, I must submit I believe the gentleman who preceded me has placed a false interpretation on the language—not deliberately, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, will he say incorrect instead of false?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes—incorrect—I was going to modify my statement as the gentleman rose to his feet.

Mr. Chairman, according to the language of this amendment, where it provides that the increase must be accomplished within the budget, except for those agencies exempted by the language, it means in effect that the head of the agency, as the head of a business might be required to do, is allowed so many millions of dollars for employee hire and that is all the money that he can expend. It is very natural to assume that under the provisions of the Jensen-Ferguson amendment, and under what we could well expect under the dictums of the Budget Bureau, that this increase could be accomplished without increasing the budget for the agency. The gentleman said he could not see how any other interpretation could be placed upon it. Therefore, I would like him to attend to this. We now have a definite rate of attrition in our agencies of something over 12½ percent of the employees. This language would prevent some rehiring. It would prevent some replacement of people who voluntarily separate themselves from the service or who are deceased. So for those of us who want to accomplish this raise, and at the same time have some regard for economy, we felt that this language would accomplish those objectives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why did you not put it in the postal pay-increase bill? I would have been against it, but why did you not put it in there?

Mr. CORBETT. I believe for the same reason that the Post Office Department was exempted under the Jensen amendment. We think they have insufficient personnel to perform the expanding service.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says that through attrition it would be accomplished. Well, I would not agree to that if it was in there. But if the gentleman says that as employees terminate their service there would be nobody appointed until their is absorption, then the gentleman would be on more tenable ground. I personally would not agree to it, but once this becomes law the increase is mandatory. How are you going to do it unless they fire a lot of their help?

Mr. CORBETT. I am very happy to answer the gentleman. I think as he thinks this through his opposition may not be so extreme. Rather than have the automatic provisions of the Jensen-Ferguson compromise applied, this allows an agency head to replace, if he wants to, some individuals. He has a budget to operate within. Under the Jensen-Ferguson amendment, if four of his top officials quit he can only replace one. This would allow him to rehire or fire as long as he stays within the terms of the budget.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman makes reference to the Jensen-Ferguson amendment and says this will take care of that, because this is a cut in

personnel. The gentleman forgets that the provisions of the Jensen-Ferguson amendment require a reduction in appropriation. In my opinion, what you are doing is reducing the appropriation some more, and therefore blindly cutting the employees in their activity. How are you going to do that?

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot yield much more, but this does not cut the appropriation 5 cents. I make no pretense about it, but it does cut the size of the payroll.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. You must realize that 3 months of the fiscal year have already expired. They are operating on a normal basis. You see how much more difficult it would make it for them to comply.

Mr. CORBETT. I would agree with the gentleman that if the provision remains as it is, we should make allowance in conference for the fact that a period of time has gone by.

Mr. BAILEY. It would be just impossible to carry it out.

Mr. CORBETT. I believe very definitely that this bill, including this amendment, accomplishes this situation, that we do grant an increased salary to all Federal employees; that we provide further that it be accomplished within the existing budget for those agencies not exempted; and I believe the final result of that will be that we will have a reduction in the Federal payroll and we will have improved salaries for those presently employed, and result in better paid and better qualified employees.

I urge the retention of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about this revised edition of the Jensen amendment that is in this bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is a supplemental Jensen amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Supplemental and revised; and in my opinion it is quite clever, too clever for the number of people involved, who we talk about in this House as the faithful employees of the Government. Too clever, entirely. It is one of those deals that most people do not like.

How are you going to make it retroactive? That language is in here. You have got to fool around with this thing. Talk about tweedledee and tweedledum. You have it here. Nobody understands it. You want to pay them. You order them paid.

It reminds me of the old Latin saying "Nemo dat quid non habet," you cannot give what you do not have. The heads of these departments cannot give it either.

I am surprised to find this language in this bill; it certainly should have the consideration of every fair-thinking person in this House. If you want to trim

somebody come out, use your pencil and trim him; do not put it in here by language of this kind that must be discovered on the floor.

I hope this language from line 19, page 5, down to and including line 8 on page 6 will be stricken from this bill in justice to the people who serve and work for the Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan and the majority leader for noticing this shell game in this bill. Frankly it reminds me of the conversation between Amos and Andy. Andy was sued. Amos said "What are you sued for?" He said: "On this contract." "Well," he said, "Andy, let me see that contract." Andy showed it to him and he said, "You is stuck." He asked "How so I am stuck?" Amos said, "Always remember, in a contract the big letters gives you something, but the little ones takes it all away."

You are giving these fellows something in these bills, but through the ingenuity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania you have taken it all away.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; I yielded to the gentleman for about 8 months, but it is still just as clear as mud to me after all that interval.

Mr. CORBETT. Certainly the gentleman and farmer should be out of the mud, but get this part clear, because the misunderstanding comes from the other side.

The salary increase is absolutely mandatory. What is required is that the agency within the amount of money appropriated to it shall provide the increase, and it can be accomplished by not filling vacancies and as a result of attrition in the department. It does not affect the very large percentage of the employees because of the exemptions provided in the bill. Whether the gentleman is for the section or not, it does provide the increase and makes it mandatory.

Mr. BURDICK. No; I still say it is a shell game.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania how many employees he seeks to fire, not to get an increase? He does not ask for an increase in this language at all; what he is asking is this, he says: "We will give you the money you had before and fire the people we are pretending we give a raise to at this time." That is the language exactly.

Mr. CORBETT. That is the confusion that rules on the other side.

Mr. RABAUT. There is no confusion. We have discovered what the gentleman attempted to do and we are bringing it to light.

Mr. BURDICK. I did not intend to start a row between you fellows. Let me finish my own fight.

For the Department of Agriculture you have provided a certain amount of money for the payment of employees in that department. That is done by the Committee on Appropriations. This bill raises the salary of everybody in the employ of the Department of Agriculture, but they cannot use any money unless they save it out of what the bill has provided. There will be nobody hired unless they can steal it from somebody else or fire somebody else. Now, that is what it means; and when you go to court with this you cannot fool the court by slippery argument; that is what it means. You can hire all the people you want to in the Department of the Interior provided you do not pay out any more money than the appropriations Congress gave that Department. So where are you going to raise the salary of anybody?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's own interpretation is to this effect, that they increase the salary of some employees and take it away altogether from others.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand from what the gentleman says, this amendment would have exactly the same effect as was the case in connection with the raise in the naval establishment about 2 years ago, in which the employees were given an hourly raise but they had to absorb it in their budget. It resulted in the drastic discharge of employees to make up for the raise of the others.

Mr. BURDICK. The reason I appear here is to speak on this amendment. I talked once today and I do not like to monopolize the time. But I hate to see the Federal employees of this Government fooled by reading in the newspapers that their salaries have been increased when we sit here and pass an act that will prevent them from receiving any money. That is the wrong way to legislate and I am not for that kind of legislation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, since I am the only Member of the Eighty-second Congress who has not spoken today I think I ought to get my name in the Record before the sun sets. I am going to pay my respects to this amendment. I call this a hocus-pocus amendment. It is like that piece of poetry which comes to my feeble mind:

Mama, may I take a swim?

Yes, my darling daughter; hang whatever you have on whatever limb you have, but don't get near the water.

My friend over there has performed a masterly piece of legislative surgery. He has told them to put everybody they want on the payroll but do not pay them. Increase their salary, but do not pay them. That is what I call legislative tight-rope walking.

It reminds me of the man who could ride two horses going in the opposite direction at the same time. I do not possess that faculty; therefore true to my wonderful record, which you know I have built up in this Congress, I am against it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I am not authorized to speak for any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but I think it is only fair to say on behalf of all of us that when this provision was under discussion in our committee nobody raised the point that this provision was put into the bill as a clever arrangement. I am sure the gentleman who used that expression repeatedly that this was "too clever" did not mean that that was the intention of any member of this committee.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES. Is it not true that in the committee there was a controversy? I opposed this in the committee and I know other members did. It seems to me the vote on that proposal was 9 to 6.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will accept the gentleman's figures in regard to it, but no one questioned the motives of those supporting this proposal as indicating a desire to cover up something. So far as I am concerned, as one member of that committee, I thought it was simply a necessary device to bring about at least some economies in the agencies of this Government.

I do not care as to the wording that might be used, and I do not have any brief for or against the wording of this proposal, but I do believe that if this proposition in this same wording or some other, were put up to the voters of my district in Missouri, they would approve it heartily. I think we have been generous here, certainly, with the postal employees, and it was our intention to be equally generous with the employees of the other agencies. I do not believe any member of the committee will dispute that.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. The Bureau—and I wish the gentleman would note this point—estimated that this bill as written would cost \$417,030,000. Now, then, granting \$417,000,000 additional salary does not mean giving them something and taking it away.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to point out further that mention has been made that this provision would put a brake on the overstaffing of the agencies of our Government. I believe that any agency of our Government could get along with less personnel than are now employed. One of the gentlemen mentioned the Department of the Interior. Why, bless your souls, you could make a study of the Department of the Interior, and on that,

or any study that has already been made, you could save 25 percent of the appropriations now being made to that Department and not hurt a single needed service of that agency. I do not care how we arrive at this thing, but I believe that everyone of us in our desire to be generous to our Federal employees has in mind also the necessity to put a brake sometime on this overstaffing of employees.

In order to make a study of that, quite recently, I talked to a few selected employees of one of our agencies. One employee—and I shall not call his name—said to me, "They are having difficulty in finding 2 hours of work for me to do in any day of the week." He said, "I could point to dozens of my associates in my division that are in the same situation as I am. We have practically nothing to do."

We are not trying to penalize anyone. As a matter of fact, I would like to see the old-line employees, the ones that have been on the payroll a long time, treated decently with a proper increase instead of just taking new employees on and on. If the wording of this proposal will accomplish that, I think to that extent it will accomplish what our fine chairman has been pleading for, that in all of our generosity we at least begin to put some limit on the overstaffing. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this might result in fewer, but certainly better, employees.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anything in the language which has been so bitterly criticized, and perhaps unjustly criticized, which would take a penny of wages or salary from anyone who remained on the payroll?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Not a single one.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anything in the language that would provoke the agency in firing any employee?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Not at all, unless, of course, it were necessary, but I do not believe it was the intention of the committee to bring about any firing. We are trying to set the brake on overstaffing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman tell me for my own edification that if they do not fire anybody, if they do not reduce the force in any manner, where there is going to be any saving? Mind you, the phraseology of this thing, as I understand, is that they will be paid their increase out of the departmental savings. Now you tell me where and how, without reducing the employees on the force, there is going to be any saving to pay these employees the additional amount that we propose to give them in this bill. It cannot be done if this remains in the bill. We trick

these employees into believing they will get something that they will not, or we will have to strike it out of the bill and give them what we gave other employees. I am in favor of striking it out.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let me answer the gentleman as best I can. Certainly I, as one Member of this body, would be the last to want to trick any of our employees, as the gentleman knows. A great many savings can be made in other ways than through the pay of personnel. There is not a single agency but what could save enough to pay the increases required in this bill. There will be resignations. There is a heavy turnover in many agencies as the gentleman knows. I think this provision would, at least, stimulate savings which will be required under this proposal. Thus it would permit the agencies to go ahead and pay the raises required by this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. But the gentleman will concede that if you do not reduce the personnel a sufficient number there will be no increase?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, I do not concede that.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman should know that there is a 12½ percent turnover normally.

Mr. DINGELL. That does not mean that you can fire that many.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in these brief 2 minutes I do not desire to impugn the motives of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or his associates on the committee. I do question their judgment. His proposition might have had some fairness about it had it applied to July 1, but I want to remind the gentleman that over 2 months of the fiscal year have already expired. This proposition is retroactive to the 1st of July on these employees. That simply means that one-fourth of the ability of that department head to meet this requirement has been removed by the fact that it is retroactive and by the fact that almost 3 months of the fiscal year have expired.

There is one other thing to which I want to call the gentleman's attention. We forced some retrenchment in the present administration of some of the executive departments, including the Veterans' Administration. They were forced to let out several thousand employees as the result of that. Let me tell the gentleman what is happening. Fifteen hundred of those are in the city of Washington. What is happening? One's and two's and three's and four's are being discharged. Did you ever hear tell of a 9, 10, or 11 being discharged by the Veterans' Administration? They have supervisors down there with 6 or 7 ratings, supervising 4 or 6 or 8 of the classifications of 2's and 3's. If you are going to do anything, why do you not go up there and designate who is to be fired and get rid of some of this overstaffing in those higher classifications? What you are going to do down here now is take a job away from some people who have to have it to exist, and you will not change the situation up in the higher brackets at all. It is silly to talk about it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on paragraph E, on page 5, because of some of my experience. I am only doing so because I had the privilege of being an administrator of a Federal program. I would like to say to you what I think this does. I know every Member of the House, in spite of some things that have been said to the contrary, is interested in economy and efficiency in our Government. You want to be from the letters you get from the people back home, whom you represent. This proposal has been put before you on the basis of your interest in economy and efficiency, and in the belief that it is economy to effectuate these savings by raising the salaries of many of the worthy Federal employees.

All of us who have had contact with Federal employees know that we have a splendid group, by and large, in our Federal service. But at the same time you see that what we are going to do is to say to the administrators of these programs, "You must pay this salary out of the money which has been appropriated."

I had a little experience with something that happened a few years ago. The appropriations were a little slow coming out, as they are this year. It is most difficult for a Federal agency to decide upon what they shall do with their budget until they finally get it. This year we are one-quarter of the year along, and some of the departments do not know yet what they are going to have in their budgets. This salary increase is mandatory. The budget officer will sit down and say, "The salary increase is mandatory." The administrator of the program will immediately distribute, to the best of his ability, the funds that are required for the salary increase, and send out separation notices. What about service? You will have services curtailed, because their personnel has been limited.

In my particular instance in protecting the budget, it meant that more notices were sent out than were required to have been sent out at the end of the year, because we did not know at that time how many resignations there would be. We did not know how many people would leave, so that we must send out enough notices to protect the budget that was set up. It was amazing to find how many of those employees that were separated found other jobs immediately. Frankly, I thought it would be difficult for them, but it was not. In my department we dismissed 45 percent, and every one of those employees found a job. It must have been a better job, because later on, when we tried to bring those trained people back, they would not come back. That was not a saving to the Department to lose experienced personnel, many trained by the Government. I have never met a Federal administrator who has not told me that he could effectuate some savings in his department if he were given the latitude to decide who he might dismiss on the separation register. Unfortunately, there are peo-

ple who are drones upon our payrolls. Because of Federal regulations, Civil Service regulations, it is almost impossible to dismiss an incompetent person. I would like to say to my good friend from Missouri, who gave a very fine explanation on the floor of this House a moment ago in connection with the attempt to bring about efficiency in Government, that I envy him in his position as a member of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because you have it in your hands to bring about some of these improvements of Federal regulations, that will give some authority to some of the administrators of our program. I agree that in the matter of economy and efficiency there must be something done in fairness to the people who pay taxes to arrive at that very thing. But you are not doing it. You are doing the very opposite of what you intend to do, if you are thinking of economy and efficiency of service, when you put in a particular provision such as that contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time in general debate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but since a controversy has arisen over the provisions of paragraph E on page 5, I feel compelled to speak. It seems to me this is a very wise provision that the committee has written into this measure. If it is properly administered it will not create an unsatisfactory situation, but instead will be very beneficial, not only to our Federal Treasury but also to the deserving employees of the Government.

In the first place let me remind you that there is a turn-over in the personnel of these departments of the Government of anywhere from 10 to as high as 50 percent each year in some classifications.

Let me also remind you, if I may, that we have seen a tremendous increase and growth in the number of Federal civilian employees in the last year or so, that at the present time we now have over 2,500,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll, and that in the last year we have had a steady increase of as many as 2,000 new employees added each day to the payroll.

I spent something like 2 years as a member of the Hoover Commission, during which we devoted a great deal of attention to the study of personnel problems. We found in department after department great overstaffing, just as did a subcommittee under the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAMS], named by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and authorized by this House to conduct an investigation of overstaffing. They found much overstaffing and so reported to this body. The Hoover Commission not only found overstaffing, but we also found in department after department what they call a dead-letter office where, because

of the peculiarities of civil-service laws and regulations which make it almost impossible for the head of a department or a supervisor to get rid of an unsatisfactory employee, that they moved the unsatisfactory employees over into this dead-letter office or section, where they are doing very little worthwhile or beneficial work. I remember an important member of the Cabinet telling us in executive session that he had nearly 10,000 employees in his department he could get along without if he could get rid of them easily. So I do not think this provision of the bill is going to work any hardship on any deserving employee. Compensate fairly and, if necessary, even liberally those who actually carry the burden of work and are doing the job. Let us give the executive officers the right and the opportunity to get rid of the drones, the troublemakers, and the shirks; save what they can by such dismissals and then grant fair pay to those who earn it.

If we keep this provision in the bill the result will be fewer employees in the Government departments, but better employees and more efficient employees, fairly compensated for what they do; and the Government will be better off. We have already provided for a reduction of personnel by the Jensen amendments to other legislation. Why back down by adopting this amendment after marching up the hill?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman feels exactly as most Members of the House feel, and as I do, that since this Congress will appropriate over \$10,000,000,000 for civilian personnel for the fiscal year 1952 there is sufficient money appropriated already to take care of the needs of the Federal employees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman fully. What I want to see done, and what I hope this House will do, is the passage of legislation that will give to the deserving workers of the Government the compensation they need to meet the increased cost of living, and that we pay the cost thereof through the elimination from the payroll of unneeded workers or by not filling jobs as they become vacant, when it is not necessary to fill them.

In other words with one hand we can and should give fair treatment and fair compensation to deserving workers, and with the other hand we can save the money to meet the cost thereof. That to me just makes good common sense. That is what we ought to do, and that is what I hope we will do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does this legislation here offer the opportunity to get rid of the drones? We are not correcting the procedure, are we?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, any official or any supervisor worthy of his salt, armed with this law, will immediately move to get rid of the drones and the troublemakers. That is where he

can and should move in. He will also probably have enough people resigning their jobs to take care of the required reduction in personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me when I say that this element of drones which exists is something that grew up within the civil service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And ought to be uprooted. But it is something this will not reach. I say to my friend that the supervisory official in a department when he runs into one of these absolutely useless individuals, under the civil service regulations he cannot remove them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, now, the gentleman is usually right, but not always.

Mr. DINGELL. Something should be done about it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the law as passed by the Congress today tells the public official he must reduce personnel in certain cases, he may use his judgment in making that reduction under the law, and that judgment should be exercised against the drones and the unsatisfactory employees.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry, but I have to disagree with my friend on his interpretation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I too am sorry if the gentleman has a different opinion. But I insist if the Congress, by a law passed subsequent to other laws requires the reduction, then they will have the authority to reduce the number of employees.

Mr. DINGELL. But not the drones.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but the gentleman is speaking on a subject I have given quite a bit of thought to. It has been emphasized by certain people who have come to my office stating they have been here for months as stenographers. They have gone to school to acquire that art. They have not even yet had a machine to work on, they have had no dictation, and they were going home to save the art of taking dictation. I had a man come in and state that he had drawn \$2,800 from the Government and he said, "I have never done 1 cent of work."

Mr. EROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman quickly, the report came to me of an employee of the Federal Government who was recently hired on a standby basis to take a job. He received his compensation while awaiting call. He was sort of stockpiled. He had done nothing, for he had not been called to active duty, yet on September 1 he re-

ceived notice from the Government that his pay had been increased. Perhaps we can do something about situations like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by title VI of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby increased by 17 percent of that part which is not in excess of \$5,000 per annum, such increase being applicable also on an annual basis to positions included in subsection 603 (c) (2) and 603 (d). Such augmented rates provided in this act shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation provided in section 603, and of

positions the incumbents of which are being compensated at rates in another pay and classification system from which they have been transferred.

SEC. 2. The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided in this act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

This act shall become effective upon the first day of the first pay period which begins after enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	\$2,600	\$2,680	\$2,760	\$2,840	\$2,920	\$3,000	\$3,080
GS-2	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
GS-3	3,050	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530
GS-4	3,275	3,355	3,435	3,515	3,595	3,675	3,755
GS-5	3,500	3,625	3,750	3,875	4,000	4,125	4,250
GS-6	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600
GS-7	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975
GS-8	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975	5,100	5,225	5,350
GS-9	5,000	5,125	5,250	5,375	5,500	5,625	5,750
GS-10	5,400	5,525	5,650	5,775	5,900	6,025	6,150
GS-11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	
GS-12	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	
GS-13	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	
GS-14	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	
GS-15	10,400	10,650	10,900	11,150	11,400		
GS-16	11,600	11,800	12,000	12,200	12,400		
GS-17	12,600	12,800	13,000	13,200	13,400		
GS-18	14,400						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	\$1,910	\$1,970	\$2,030	\$2,090	\$2,150	\$2,210	\$2,270
CPC-2	2,520	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940
CPC-3	2,652	2,732	2,812	2,892	2,972	3,052	3,132
CPC-4	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
CPC-5	3,074	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554
CPC-6	3,300	3,380	3,460	3,540	3,620	3,700	3,780
CPC-7	3,525	3,625	3,725	3,825	3,925	4,025	4,125
CPC-8	3,800	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550
CPC-9	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925
CPC-10	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,800 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,940 per annum."

"(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

"(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding schedule or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

"(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

"(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

"(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

"(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

"(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous salaries' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

"(d) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 701.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

"(e) No appropriations or funds available to any department or independent establishment (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch of the Government for personal services during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be apportioned, on account of the increase in rates of compensation provided by this section and section 3 (a), in a manner which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation for such fiscal year. This subsection shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department or to any department or independent establishment, or any part thereof, which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense.

"Sec. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of \$400 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"(b) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the second paragraph under the heading "Increased Pay for Legislative Employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to any officer or employee subject to subsection (a), but no such officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of such acts or of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation, or basic compensation plus additional compensation, at a rate in excess of \$11,246 per annum.

"(c) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by \$400 per annum.

"Sec. 3. The rates of annual basic compensation specifically provided by law for the following officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government are hereby increased by \$400:

"(1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended;

"(2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"Sec. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date

of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the controversial paragraph (e).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES to the committee amendment: Page 5, line 19, strike out paragraph (e), starting line 19, page 5, and ending line 8, page 6.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, unless this amendment is adopted the passage of this bill will be but an empty gesture. It will not give the Federal employees the salary increase that was intended by the sponsors of this legislation. It will not give these employees the same treatment that we just voted for the postal employees.

Paragraph (e) which my amendment will eliminate would unfairly affect a majority of Federal employees. I am inclined to agree with my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] in what he said about the provision. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], who introduced this amendment in the committee, knows full well that no such proposal as this would ever be considered in our State of Pennsylvania where his party is a majority. Just last November we went through a campaign where his party said, "No more new taxes. We have got to stop this tax and tax and spend and spend." This very day in the Pennsylvania State Legislature they are considering the biggest tax program in the history of our State. They have the biggest spending program and the biggest bureaucracy on record. You never hear of a Jensen amendment or this kind of proposal where his party has complete control. It is unfair, impractical, and unsound. I think the provision should be stricken in order that classified employees can have the increases that we gave to other Federal employees, an increase to which they are justly entitled.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment has been pretty well discussed during general debate, and I hope that there will be a limitation placed on the debate and that we bring it to a vote hurriedly.

However, in reply to the gentleman's remarks and about other persons saying that this particular section makes the bill an empty gesture, I want to remind them that this empty gesture is going to cost the taxpayers \$417,000,000. Now look. Just to get this thing clear and

understandable, I will repeat. This legislation makes mandatory a \$400 across-the-board increase for every classified worker, every judicial employee and every executive employee. The section says, however, that as regards the executive departments, which are not exempted by reason of them being defense agencies as designated by the President, that they shall accomplish these increases within existing budgets. It means briefly that the employees will get \$400 per year increases, those who are retained. It is our belief and our very sincere belief that because of resignations and deaths and transfers this particular job can be done by an agency head who is worthy of his hire. I believe that the head of any private business, given so much for salary purposes, can learn to live within that budget and I do not see any reason why our agency heads cannot learn to live within the budget, particularly when it is liberal.

I want to point out that as we have talked so often about more savings in government, here is an opportunity for the Congress to answer the mandate of the people and order the executive branch to put its house in order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is this statement correct, that this legislation affects approximately 200,000 employees and only those that are not in defense agencies?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman, as usual, is correct. It is between 200,000 and 220,000 employees.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman say whether he understands the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Bureau of Customs, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue to be in the category of defense agencies?

Mr. CORBETT. Well, I do not know whether the Executive would determine exactly whether they are or not. I certainly think the fund-raising agencies and the FBI, given the job of ferreting out subversive activities, would be defense agencies, at least according to my interpretation of this provision.

Mr. CANFIELD. I emphasize the Bureau of Narcotics because the House recently voted an increase for it.

Mr. CORBETT. I certainly would agree with the gentleman that activity of that kind is certainly in the national defense.

I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about this section. I believe that perhaps its intent is misunderstood. I want to emphasize in closing that when a bill is going to pour \$417,000,000 of additional funds into the pockets of the Federal employees it is certainly not an empty gesture or hocus-pocus.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the lateness of the hour and the adequate time we have had to discuss this measure, I move that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the following letter opposing the provisions of this paragraph was written by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1951.

HON. TOM MURRAY, Chairman,
Post Office and Civil Service Com-
mittee, House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MURRAY: May I take this opportunity to invite your attention to the provisions of section 2 (e) of H. R. 339, a bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The section of the bill I am referring to is quoted as follows:

"No appropriations or funds available to any department or independent establishment (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch of the Government for personal services during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be apportioned, on account of the increase in rates of compensation provided by this section and section 3 (a), in a manner which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation for such fiscal year. This subsection shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department or to any department or independent establishment, or any part thereof, which the President determines to be engaged in activities essential to the national defense."

The requirement that the Civil Service Commission absorb the cost of pay increases for its employees would add materially to the problems we already have in attempting to process our workloads and carry out the operating programs for which we are responsible. In short, it would mean the loss of additional employees over and above those we are required to lose under other restrictions. Let me cite to you a few specific figures:

1. Section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1952 (the Jensen amendment) prohibits us from filling vacancies until such time as our July 1, 1951, employment strength has been reduced by 10 percent. Since we had approximately 4,580 employees on our rolls July 1, 1951, a 10 percent reduction in personnel by non-filling of vacancies will mean a loss of 458 employees.

2. Under the terms of the House bill to grant salary increases to Federal employees at a flat \$400 amount, the cost to the Civil Service Commission will be approximately \$1,800,000 per year.

In terms of the Senate bill, providing for a straight 10-percent increase with a limitation of \$800, it would cost the Commission approximately \$1,700,000.

3. The cost of the increases provided for in either of these two bills would considerably more than offset the savings we would realize through the operation of the Jensen amendment. In other words it would mean that we would lose additional employees over and above the 458 required by the Jensen amendment. In addition, as a further offsetting factor, we are advised that the President has approved a supplemental request for the Civil Service Commission amounting to \$1,700,000, which is required because of the alarming backlog of work in connection with loyalty determinations. To the extent this supplemental request is approved by the Congress, such additional hirings, resulting from the use of these funds, will result in further

losses in total personnel in order to meet the increased salaries provided for by the pending legislation.

4. For the current fiscal year the Budget Bureau approved \$23,000,000 for the Commission. This amount was reduced by the Congress to \$17,500,000, a reduction of \$5,500,000. It is not possible for the Commission to keep current with its work because of this reduction, and it is for that reason we have asked for a supplemental appropriation. If the Commission is required to absorb the cost of salary increases it will offset the benefit we hope to get from the supplemental appropriation. I am sure the Congress does not want the Commission to be so situated that it cannot keep reasonably current with the investigation of loyalty.

For the reasons stated, I firmly believe that the Commission should not be required to absorb the cost of salary increases resulting from this legislation. To do so will lessen our ability to operate effectively, particularly in those areas where backlogs of work have accumulated and will continue to mount so long as we are not able to retain or hire the required personnel.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 78, noes 98.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RHODES and Mr. REES of Kansas.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported they were—ayes 117, noes 117.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GATHINGS). The Chair votes in the affirmative, and the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: Page 6, line 9, strike out "Sec. 2 (a)", line 9 through line 15, and insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of not less than \$400 per annum or 10 percent whichever is higher: *Provided*, That no increase for any individual shall exceed \$800 per annum; *Provided further*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I discussed when the rule was under consideration. It is an amendment that is different from any other section of this bill in that it carries a minimum of \$400 instead of providing a \$400 across-the-board raise, and it also adds a percentage of 10 percent. The reason for the 10 percent in this amendment is this: When the other body passed the bill, just yesterday, they provided a 10-percent increase for all employees with the exception of the Capitol Hill employees and those working in the legislative establishment, our clerks here at the table, our assistant door-

keeper, your own secretaries, the policemen about the building and out on the grounds, and all the employees of Capitol Hill; they inadvertently omitted the raise of 8.8-percent increase in the legislative branch to 10 percent.

A former distinguished Member of this body, Senator MONRONEY, who offered the amendment, said it was by inadvertence. I therefore consulted with him and worked out this amendment so that when this bill goes to conference there will be a discussion of the 10-percent increase; otherwise, if we do not adopt this 10-percent provision, automatically, they will consider the 8.8-percent increase and our Capitol Hill employees will get only 8.8, and the 10-percent increase cannot even be mentioned in the conference.

The reason I offer a \$400 minimum is this: Personally I think that the workers on Capitol Hill are entitled to \$400 minimum and not over \$800 maximum, because they do not have rights under civil service, as I stated in my remarks under the rule. If you fire your secretary tonight—and you can do it—she has no right of appeal. She has no sick leave; she has no annual leave. It is through our graciousness that we give her a vacation; otherwise she has no discretion in the matter, neither does she have any accrued leave to collect, as she would have were she under civil service. For that reason I think they are entitled to the same consideration that we give to the employees downtown.

Another thing, they do not work regular hours; secretaries report early in the morning and often work until 8, 9, 10, 11, and even 12 o'clock at night; they come down on Saturdays, and many work on Sundays; they are most loyal. They are going to vote, work, and campaign for you whether you vote for this amendment or not. But I am not thinking of votes now, I am thinking only that justice should be done to this group of loyal people. Your secretary can make you or break you, for when you are here on the floor or attending conferences or away from your office, it is your office employees who are responsible for your office efficiency, the employees on Capitol Hill are the ones who look after our welfare. When you are over here on the floor they are continuously on the job, they are ever diligent.

This amendment is so fair that I appeal to my friend and neighbor from the Volunteer State to accept the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I cannot accept the gentleman's amendment. As I have told the gentleman all along we will work it out in conference.

Mr. SUTTON. But how can you work it out in conference when there is no mention of 10 percent in the bill? There is nothing in the Senate bill but 8.8 percent, and you cannot even speak of 10 percent if it does not appear in one of the bills.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. RHODES. I think the gentleman's amendment is meritorious. I will give the gentleman's amendment my support.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the gentleman's assistance and I hope our amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think that the employees of the legislative branch will be better off with the 8.8 percent than with the 10 percent? The 10 percent applies to their basic salary.

Mr. SUTTON. That is the reason that I put in a minimum of \$400 and make it 10 percent; because, if it is only 8.8 percent some will get \$150, whereas under my amendment they would get \$400.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Under the present bill does the legislative employee get \$400?

Mr. SUTTON. If we do not adopt my amendment, then under the Senate bill they would get 8.8 percent.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This bill gives every employee from the lowest bracket to the highest \$400. Why then do you want to make a discrimination?

Mr. SUTTON. If you will insist on that in conference, that is different, but how are we going to know that you will? Let us adopt this amendment, then we will have something to go to conference on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM to the committee amendment: Page 8, line 10, after the period insert a new section as follows:

"() Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this act or other acts to the contrary, the provisions of this act shall apply to all State and county committees, employees, and field agents of the various State and county United States Department of Agriculture Production and Marketing Administration offices."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely allows the raise to go to all AAA or PMA officials of the Department of Agriculture in the various States and county committees. It is only fair. They have been trying to get this for a number of years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would explain his amendment further.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In effect they are already Federal employees, however, they are not paid as other Federal employees are.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Are they paid by Federal funds alone?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are actually paid by Federal funds which are disbursed through State PMA offices. It is an indirect method of paying Federal

funds. In my amendment I state "notwithstanding any other provisions" they are to be considered under this act.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Will this amendment of the gentleman provide for a \$400 payment to PMA board members?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This applies to the committee amendment. It applies to county and State committeemen and State officers who are paid out of PMA funds.

Mr. SUTTON. Your county committeemen do not make \$400 a year now.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is all right, they should.

Mr. SUTTON. They will not average over \$100 a year.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The State offices and county committees are having difficulty in securing administrative officers, clerks, bookkeepers, field agents, stenographers, and other employees.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact this money comes out of money that otherwise would go to pay the farmers for soil-conservation practices and if you pay the committeemen \$400 additional there will not be a thing left to pay for soil-conservation practices?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No, that is not true.

Mr. POAGE. It is true.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not true. The gentlemen from Arkansas and Texas fail to understand my amendment. This will be in addition to the funds which presently come from the State offices.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, this House is certainly in the mood to raise salaries and wages if we adopt this amendment which would raise in the amount of \$400 per year the salaries and wages of every person in anywise connected with the Production and Marketing Administration, even though he may now be receiving only traveling expenses—and maybe a token payment—for his services.

I have voted for postal and classified employee wage and salary adjustments in an effort to afford these people just entitlements. I have always found that you receive in employment just about what you pay for—no more and no less. I have never felt that any employer gains anything by underpaying his employees. But, now, this idea of throwing away \$400 per year to everybody who is connected in anywise—shape, form, or fashion—with the Production and Marketing Administration where he is now only receiving actual expenses is something that I just cannot string along with. I cannot support this giveaway provision for many reasons.

First, this Government cannot afford such activities. Second, the \$400 that would be paid to committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration would be deducted from the over-

all conservation program. This money could be used more advantageously to carry out soil-conservation practices. Third, even the recipients would object to the adoption of this amendment, because those committeemen are high-class citizens anxious to promote the conservation practices and would not think of depriving the program of this money. Those committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration are conducting the required grass-roots administration of this program, which has made it successful. They meet at the courthouse or some other place within the county once or twice a month for the purpose of administering the PMA program on behalf of themselves and their neighbors. They do not consider themselves Government employees and are not the type of people who would even suggest that this money be taken from the soil-conservation practices and given to them in the form of salaries.

I have asked the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma, whether his proposed \$400 raise would also include the committeemen of the PMA program who are now receiving only expenses—and maybe a token payment, I don't know. He has told this House in answer to my question that the committeemen would and should be included. His amendment states that the act before us shall apply to all State and county committeemen, employees and field agents of the State and county United States Department of Agriculture Production and Marketing Administration offices.

Now, I favor the act applying to all employees and field agents of the State and county Production and Marketing Administration offices; but may I reemphasize that even the committeemen themselves would protest this \$400 per year contribution which would be paid out of soil-conservation funds. Those committeemen are farmers—the backbone of the Nation—and are interested in conservative governmental operations.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who does know something about the agricultural program, do the PMA employees within the counties on a permanent basis come within the increase provided in this bill even though they may not be civil-service employees. Since the PMA personnel are Federal employees, it would seem to me that the gentleman from Oklahoma does have a point that should be considered concerning these permanent Federal employees.

Mr. POAGE. These committeemen—

Mr. HARRIS. I am not talking about committeemen.

Mr. POAGE. That is what the gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about, and that is what the amendment relates to. These men who are paid at the present time for coming to the courthouse once or twice a month and get over the year \$50 to \$60 in expenses now, he would give each one of them an additional \$400

a year, and that money comes not out of the appropriations for that purpose but comes out of the money that you appropriate to carry on soil-conservation practices, and the more you pay out in salaries the less you have got to carry on the practices, and there will not be a penny left in a great many of the counties of the United States if you pay this \$400.

Mr. HARRIS. Some of these people have talked to me about it. They are Federal employees. I agree with the gentleman insofar as committeemen are concerned, but you have got full-time Federal employees at the head of offices in each county, as well as clerks. They are semi-civil-service employees. They are paid by the Federal Government. Are they included in your \$400 raise?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, are they considered employees of the Department of Agriculture and do they get their pay by Federal checks? If so, they are included.

Mr. TACKETT. This salary readjustment act should apply to all employees of the Production and Marketing Administration—including employees and field agents of the various State and county offices—but not to the committeemen. The committee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, has just advised this House, in response to a question by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], that such State and county employees of the Production and Marketing Administration come within the increase provided in this pay-readjustment bill. However, I am hopeful that the gentleman from Oklahoma will revise his proposed amendment so as to make the bill under consideration applicable to all State and county employees and field agents of the Production and Marketing Administration offices, because I cannot believe that he would even request us to support the amendment in its present form.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that board members be excluded from my amendment and it be applied to the others.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]. The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee) there were—ayes, 195, noes 12.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GATHINGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 339) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 421, he reported the bill back to

the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for

the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) sections 603 (b) and 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1.....	\$2,420	\$2,500	\$2,580	\$2,660	\$2,740	\$2,820	\$2,900
GS-2.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
GS-3.....	2,915	2,995	3,075	3,155	3,235	3,315	3,395
GS-4.....	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400	3,480	3,560	3,640
GS-5.....	3,410	3,535	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160
GS-6.....	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545
GS-7.....	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955
GS-8.....	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370
GS-9.....	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810
GS-10.....	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250
GS-11.....	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940	
GS-12.....	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040	
GS-13.....	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360	
GS-14.....	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15.....	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16.....	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17.....	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18.....	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1.....	\$1,660	\$1,720	\$1,780	\$1,840	\$1,900	\$1,960	\$2,020
CPC-2.....	2,330	2,400	2,470	2,540	2,610	2,680	2,750
CPC-3.....	2,475	2,555	2,635	2,715	2,795	2,875	2,955
CPC-4.....	2,695	2,775	2,855	2,935	3,015	3,095	3,175
CPC-5.....	2,940	3,020	3,100	3,180	3,260	3,340	3,420
CPC-6.....	3,180	3,270	3,350	3,430	3,510	3,590	3,670
CPC-7.....	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8.....	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9.....	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10.....	4,565	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,610 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,750 per annum."

(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate

at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

(c) (1) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 671 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

(d) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit

and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head "Miscellaneous salaries" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act 1951 ("Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(e) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this act shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 2. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of (1) 8.8 percent of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or (2) \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of paragraph (b) under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of Senators, but no officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation or basic compensation plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law.

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

(A) \$3,540 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than 3,000,000;

(B) \$3,720 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 3,000,000 or more but less than 5,000,000;

(C) \$4,260 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 5,000,000 or more but less than 10,000,000; and

(D) \$4.44 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is ten million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "\$5,280" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,820"; and by striking out "\$6,720" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,320."

(d) The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act is amended by striking out, in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate" the words "\$1 per thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2 per thousand." The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in such paragraph.

(e) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the

House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), and of the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, are hereby increased by 8.8 percent or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

SEC. 3. (a) The annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as increased by the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945, as amended, and by the act entitled "An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 10 percent or \$800, whichever is the lesser. The proviso contained in the first sentence of the first section of said act of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or member covered by this section shall, by reason of the enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of \$11,130 per annum.

(b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addition to the compensation already provided by such act and by the act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the aggregate compensation provided by said acts, or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

(2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary classes in title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 10 percent or \$800, whichever is the lesser.

(c) Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	\$2,600	\$2,680	\$2,760	\$2,840	\$2,920	\$3,000	\$3,080
GS-2	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
GS-3	3,050	3,130	3,210	3,290	3,370	3,450	3,530
GS-4	3,275	3,355	3,435	3,515	3,595	3,675	3,755
GS-5	3,500	3,625	3,750	3,875	4,000	4,125	4,250
GS-6	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600
GS-7	4,225	4,350	4,475	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975
GS-8	4,600	4,725	4,850	4,975	5,100	5,225	5,350
GS-9	5,000	5,125	5,250	5,375	5,500	5,625	5,750
GS-10	5,400	5,525	5,650	5,775	5,900	6,025	6,150
GS-11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	
GS-12	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	
GS-13	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	
GS-14	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	
GS-15	10,400	10,650	10,900	11,150	11,400		
GS-16	11,600	11,800	12,000	12,200	12,400		
GS-17	12,600	12,800	13,000	13,200	13,400		
GS-18	14,400						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	\$1,910	\$1,970	\$2,030	\$2,090	\$2,150	\$2,210	\$2,270
CPC-2	2,520	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940
CPC-3	2,652	2,732	2,812	2,892	2,972	3,052	3,132
CPC-4	2,850	2,930	3,010	3,090	3,170	3,250	3,330
CPC-5	3,074	3,154	3,234	3,314	3,394	3,474	3,554
CPC-6	3,300	3,380	3,460	3,540	3,620	3,700	3,780
CPC-7	3,525	3,625	3,725	3,825	3,925	4,025	4,125
CPC-8	3,800	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550
CPC-9	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925
CPC-10	4,550	4,675	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$13,800 per annum."

(d) (1) Hereafter Foreign Service officers, including the class of career minister, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees, shall be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended and supplemented.

(2) Sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and all other provisions of such act which are inconsistent with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

(3) Section 202 (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(4) The compensation of any Foreign Service officer or Foreign Service staff officer or employee who is an officer or employee of the United States on the effective date of this amendment shall not be reduced by reason of the provisions of this amendment; but when any such position becomes vacant any new appointee shall be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedules of, and regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission under, the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The rate of basic compensation for physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased 10 percent or \$800 per annum, whichever is the lesser.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1951.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 622 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 339 as passed, as follows: "That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of \$2,800 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of \$2,940 per annum.

"(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

"(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this act; and

"(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act as follows:

"(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

"(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in such maximum longevity rate.

"(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the rate for like positions under such section.

"(c) The limitations of \$9,600 and \$13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous salaries' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

"(d) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 701.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a)."

"Sec. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of not less than \$400 per annum or 10 percent whichever is higher: *Provided*, That no increase for any individual shall exceed \$800 per annum: *Provided further*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"(b) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the second paragraph under the heading 'Increased

pay for legislative employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to any officer or employee subject to subsection (a), but no such officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of such acts or of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation, or basic compensation plus additional compensation, at a rate in excess of \$11,246 per annum.

"(c) The rate of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the Presiding Officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of the Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by \$400 per annum.

"Sec. 3. The rates of annual basic compensation specifically provided by law for the following officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government are hereby increased by \$400:

"(1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended;

"(2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"Sec. 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act; except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 339 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the

bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense areas and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ORDERLY COTTON MARKETING PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, 100 representatives from throughout the Cotton Belt have today joined me in urging cotton farmers to participate in the orderly marketing program by placing at least half of their 1951 crop into the Commodity Credit Corporation loan until a fair market price develops.

I am introducing the statement which we have signed, together with the names of those who have joined in signing it, as a part of my remarks.

The holding movement can be a weapon in the hands of the farmer to convert a buyer's market into a seller's market. Demand factors now apparent in the cotton supply picture make it clear that the current price for cotton is not at a fair level for the producer. If the farmer will act to exercise greater control of the market himself, there is hope of getting this fair price while cotton still remains in the farmers' hands.

This holding movement represents a great opportunity for the cotton farmer to change the historic pattern of market factors which combine to depress the price during the marketing season. It is an opportunity which should not be passed up.

The farmer cannot hope to get the best price for his cotton unless he takes concerted action throughout the Cotton Belt.

The statement follows:

The cotton farmers of America, in response to a call from their Government in the name of national defense, have produced a record crop for 1951, now being harvested. Unless coordinated action is taken by the cotton farmer and the Government, however, the reward for this patriotic demonstration of American productive power is likely to be financial penalties to be borne by the producer.

At a time when the costs of cotton production are the highest in history, the price has declined 10 cents per pound. Urgent steps are needed to develop a stable market, and to offer hope for a better price.

Those of us who represent the cotton farming areas have initiated steps by the Government designed to improve the demand for cotton, but these various actions will have no full cumulative effect until well beyond the normal marketing season. The one weapon in the hand of the farmer is the withholding of his cotton from the market until a fair price is reached.

Cotton can be withheld from the market in an orderly fashion, without undue risk for the farmer, by placing it in the loan

program with the Commodity Credit Corporation. All major farm organizations representing cotton producers have urged that farmers take advantage of this program.

As representatives in Congress of the cotton farmer, we want to urge all cotton producers to join this program for orderly marketing. If every cotton farmer will place half of his crop in the loan as it is picked and ginned, or otherwise withhold it from the market, there is real hope that the price can be improved. The operation of the market during the first months of the harvest season indicates the withholding program has been of considerable benefit. If the movement spreads, the farmer will have made the most effective use possible of the price support structure which the Government has provided.

FRANK SMITH; HAROLD D. COOLEY; T. G. AERNETHY; W. R. POAGE; FRANK IKARD; LINDLEY BECKWORTH; E. L. FORRESTER; JAMES P. RICHARDS; W. F. NORRELL; E. C. GATHINGS; ROBERT L. SIKES; TOM STEED; OMAR BURLISON; CARROLL REECE; WOODROW W. JONES; TOM PICKETT; CARL T. DURHAM; ROBERT E. JONES, JR.; CLIFFORD DAVIS; JOE L. EVINS; CARL ELIOTT; KENNETH A. ROBERTS; JOSEPH R. BRYSON; E. E. COX; JOHN H. KERR; HERBERT C. BONNER; JAMIE L. WHITTEN; JOHN E. LYLE, JR.; W. M. (DON) WHEELER; JERE COOPER; ANTONIO FERNANDEZ; CLARK W. THOMPSON; TOM MURRAY; ALBERT RAINS; HAROLD A. PATTEN; OLIN TEAGUE; HOMER THORNBERRY; PAUL JONES; VICTOR WICKERSHAM; HENRY D. LARCADE; PORTER HARDY, JR.; ARTHUR WINSTEAD; BROOKS HAYS; E. E. WILLIS; F. EDWARD HEBERT; A. SIDNEY CAMP; PAUL BROWN; PRINCE H. PRESTON; JAMES W. TRIMBLE; TOBY MORRIS; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS; F. E. CARLYLE; ED. DEGRAFFENRIED; PAT SUTTON; OVERTON BROOKS; JOHN PHILLIPS; GEO. ANDREWS; GEO. GRANT; HENDERSON LANHAM; OTTO E. PASSMAN; O. C. FISHER; GEORGE MAHON; ERNEST BRAMBLETT; GRAHAM BARDEN; ALLAN O. HUNTER; MENDELL RIVERS; ALBERT GORE; MONROE M. REDDEN; ROBERT L. DOUGHTON; WILBUR D. MILLS; JOHN J. DEMPSEY; BOYD TACKETT; OREN HARRIS; W. J. BRYAN DORN; CHARLES B. DEANE; WILLIAM STIGLER; CARL VINSON; A. S. HERLONG, JR.; J. PERCY PRIEST; CARL ALBERT; HAMILTON C. JONES; JOHN R. MURDOCK; LAURIE C. BATTLE; JOHN L. McMILLAN; J. FRANK WILSON; KEN REGAN; NOBLE J. GREGORY; JAMES C. DAVIS; THOMAS H. WERDEL; GEO. B. SCHWABE; WRIGHT PATMAN; JOHN J. RILEY; HALE BOGGS; THURMOND CHATHAM; WM. M. COLMER; JIMMY MORRISON; C. W. BISHOP; WINGATE LUCAS; JOHN S. WOOD; WALTER ROGERS.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to find out from the majority leader the program for Monday and the remainder of next week, if he has that information available at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to give the gentleman the information I have now, although I can only announce the program for Monday as yet. There are no rules reported out. The Committee on Rules is meeting tomorrow.

I am hopeful they will report out rules on some of the bills on which requests for rules are pending before that committee.

Monday is District day, and there are 10 bills that will be called up by that committee. They are as follows:

H. R. 3860, to amend the act relating to retirement of public-school teachers.

H. R. 4419, to amend the Teachers' Salary Act of 1947.

H. R. 4703, the school officers and employees annual leave bill.

H. R. 4726, to amend section 15 of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

H. R. 4859, relating to additional compensation, holidays, for firemen and the police force.

H. R. 5256, to secure attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings.

H. R. 5329, with regard to salary increase for school teachers, the police force, and firemen.

S. 657, to amend and clarify the Teachers' Leave Act of 1949.

S. 945, to amend the Teachers' Salary Act of 1947.

S. 1349, to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools.

After the Committee on Rules reports tomorrow, I will know what rules there are, and I will advise the leadership on the other side as quickly thereafter as possible as to the further program for next week.

I can say definitely for the guidance of the Members that if a rule is reported out in connection with the bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act, that will not be brought up before Thursday.

There is another bill increasing the loan authorization of the Export-Import Bank. I understand that that bill was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There are one or two other bills on which rules have been requested.

I might also say that I have scheduled a light day for Wednesday of next week in accordance with an agreement that I have made.

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the Members of the House at this time as definitely as I can in relation to the program for next week, but I am sorry I cannot be more definite. Tomorrow, however, I will be in a position where I can tell more about the program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I observe the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia present in the Chamber. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if he has any controversial matters coming up from his committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think that any of the bills that we have coming up on Monday will be controversial, and there should not be any roll calls on them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire further of the distinguished majority leader, if he has any information as to conference reports?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of course as to when the conference reports will be brought up, but as always we have in mind and always consider the membership so far as possible.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the House going to adjourn over from today until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to make that request now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight, Friday, to file reports on sundry bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the legislative program of the day and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DEMPSEY and include an article from the Clovis Journal.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN and to include an article. Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include certain material regarding the Veterans' Administration, and another matter.

Mr. MEADER and include certain extraneous material relating to the Post Office Department.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an editorial.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include extraneous material.

Mr. POULSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENNY and to include an article by Chester Potter, Scripps-Howard staff writer.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a resolution.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a letter.

Mr. SABATH.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATTERSON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 436. An act to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 47. An act for the relief of Madeleine Quarez;

S. 76. An act for the relief of Herbert H. Heller;

S. 83. An act for the relief of First Lt. James E. Willcox;

S. 168. An act for the relief of Helmuth Assmass Balthasar Russow and Volker Harpe;

S. 295. An act for the relief of Michail Ioannou Bourbakis;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Teruko Okuaki;

S. 427. An act for the relief of Nene Baalstad;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro;

S. 495. An act for the relief of Richard J. Walling;

S. 501. An act for the relief of William Houwink;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Wilma M. Stiehl;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Polly Anne Caldwell;

S. 665. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

S. 880. An act for the relief of Ann Lamplugh;

S. 906. An act for the relief of Marie Kristine Hansen;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Ella Maria Nyman;

S. 1028. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lou Wong Shong Ngon;

S. 1107. An act for the relief of I. N. Norman;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Davis Min Lee;

S. 1425. An act for the relief of Mrs. Okuni Kobayashi;

S. 1504. An act for the relief of Valmai Eileen Mackenzie;

S. 1562. An act for the relief of Harvey Marden; and

S. 1786. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and catastrophes of nature.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. VINSON, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 24, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

799. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a letter reporting a vio-

lation by an employee of the Department of State under subsection (h) of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to subsection i (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

800. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

801. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Jose Lancelle Hayles or Lance Errington Hayles or Lance Hayles, file No. A-7476189 CR 34617, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

802. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Kazimierz or Casimir Bobrowski, file No. A-6192804 CR 34766 and Henrik Goldstein, file No. A-6465695 CR 34663, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

803. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Sister Clare Violeta Ibolya Brosz, file No. A-6604457 CR 34630, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

804. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore-leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the Internal Security Act, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

805. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

806. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Josette Louise Lucienne Natter, file No. A-7439854 CR 32729, and Daniele Raymonde Josette Natter, file No. A-7439855 CR 32729, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

808. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Security Council, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled "National Security Council Determination No. 17," pursuant to section 1302, Public Law 45 (Third Supplemental Appropria-

tion Act, 1951); to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 5411. A bill to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5424. A bill to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5425. A bill to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 5426. A bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5427. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, so as to reduce the amount of the deductions which may be made on account of outside income from the benefits payable to certain individuals thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5428. A bill to prohibit justices and judges of the United States from testifying as to the character or reputation of any person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5429. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5430. A bill to suspend certain import duties on zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 5431. A bill to provide that the income limitations contained in section 203 of the Social Security Act shall not apply during the remainder of the present national emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5432. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE:

H. J. Res. 332. Joint resolution to establish a Missouri Basin Survey Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution proposing that the United States must go

all-out in atomic development and production; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 422. Resolution to provide for an investigation of action taken by the Defense Production Administration and other agencies with respect to certificates of necessity for emergency facilities, in authorizing construction, in making direct loans for plant expansion, with respect to price stabilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 423. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 424. Resolution providing for further amounts to cover the expenses incurred by House Resolution 423, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 425. Resolution providing for investigation of low-flying airliners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 426. Resolution providing that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the old-age retirement and survivors benefits provided under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. Res. 427. Resolution providing for investigation of low-flying airliners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 or rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5433. A bill for the relief of Leon Lawrence Hamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5434. A bill for the relief of Margaretha Rath Rahneberg and Erich Rahneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5435. A bill for the relief of Heinz Karl Doege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of Yoichi and Katoko Kusakari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5437. A bill for the relief of Motoko Sakurada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of Walter Frederick Bertram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of J. Paul Bisnaire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 5440. A bill for the relief of Dana S. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5441. A bill for the relief of Stevan Cuckovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Dekking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

429. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, Lincoln Post No. 4, Detroit, Mich., urging enactment of legislation providing for the reinstatement of unemployment features of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

430. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Kenosha, Wis., urging the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in their efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis and to urge the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency, Tass, as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

431. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Aerie No. 01188, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Latrobe, Pa., urging the Federal Government to secure the freedom of William N. Oatis and bar correspondents of Soviet news agency, Tass, and satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences until release of William N. Oatis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday,
September 19, 1951)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of Lights, in a world that lieth in darkness, swept by the fitful winds of doubt and despair, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that the light within us is not dimmed. Out of the shadows we would lift our faces to the one true light, knowing that if we keep our hearts with Thee there is no darkness from without which can quench the light that is within.

In this desperate hour when the world's hope of a brighter tomorrow is committed to our frail hands, join us to the great company of unconquered spirits who in evil times have stood their ground, preserving the heritage of man's best, and whose flaming faith has made their lives as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 20, 1951, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized

to meet today during the session of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor under the unanimous-consent agreement. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I concluded my remarks yesterday I was discussing that portion of the tax bill which deals with the subject of tax-free redemption of stock to pay estate taxes. I have a brief survey of that, but prior to introducing it I should like to make a few remarks to tie our two days of argument together in one piece, for a continuous analysis of the bill.

It is my feeling that the tax bill, first of all, must make provisions for raising more revenue than it does if we are to meet the cost of our defense program and the cost of our governmental expenditures for the fiscal year 1952.

Secondly, it is only proper that, before any effort is made to increase the tax burden upon the great rank and file of our people and upon the legitimate enterprises of American business, we should plug loopholes in the tax law.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly about the urgency and the ethical necessity for developing a firm and fair tax base. I feel this particularly now, since we are going to be compelled, by the exigencies of national defense, by the imperatives of the protection of our freedom, to raise a considerable revenue for our defense establishments and for our commitments at home and abroad. To put it in another way, we ought to have a tax system that has as much equity in it as is humanly possible; we ought to have a tax system that continues to be based upon the sound and democratic principle of the ability to pay; we ought to have a tax system in which earned income constitutes one part of the broad base of our taxation and legitimate corporate profits represent the other part of the base of our tax system. We ought to have a tax system in which there are as few openings or as few temptations for tax avoidance as the human mind can possibly contrive or conceive.